

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
FIRST ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE
ASSOCIATION
OF
AMERICAN COLLEGES
HELD AT
CHICAGO, ILL.
January 14-16, 1915

Edited by
R. Watson Cooper
Secretary of the Association

Published by the Association

Office of the Secretary
Fayette, Iowa

By order of the Executive Committee, arrangements have been made for the next Annual Meeting of the Association, at Chicago, Hotel Sherman, January, 20, 21 and 22, 1916.

Association of American Colleges

FIRST ANNUAL MEETING

Chicago, January 14, 15, 16, 1915

PROGRAM OF MEETINGS

THURSDAY EVENING, JANUARY 14

(Joint session Association of American Colleges and Council of Church Boards of Education.)

The Moral and Religious Phases of Education.

The Christian Ideal of Education—Wm. Frasier McDowell, D. D., Bishop M. E. Church.

The Methods of its Attainment—Henry Churchill King, Ph. D., President Oberlin College.

Discussion led by Cleland B. McAfee, D. D., McCormick Theological Seminary.

FRIDAY MORNING, JANUARY 15

10:00 A. M.

The Place and Function of the New Association.

The possibilities of more effective co-operation of the American colleges for the promotion of higher education—P. P. Claxton, Ph. D., United States Commissioner of Education.

The relation of the college association to existing associations—Stephen B. L. Penrose, D. D., President of Whitman College.

Shall the denominational or independent college ask for state support?—Chancellor S. B. McCormick, LL. D., University of Pittsburgh.

Discussion, led by Hill M. Bell, LL. D., President of Drake University, and W. F. Slocum, LL. D., President of Colorado College.

ASSOCIATION OF

FRIDAY AFTERNOON

2:00 P. M.

Business session—The adoption of the constitution. The appointment of committees.

2:30 P. M.

The Best Manner in which the Executive of a College can Employ Time and Put Forth Effort

- (1) Work on the campus—Abram Harris, LL. D., President Northwestern University.
- (2) Work in the field—Louis E. Holden, LL. D., President University of Wooster.
- (3) Shall the executive teach?—John Willis Baer, LL. D., President of Occidental College.

Discussion led by Donald J. Cowling, D. D., President of Carleton College, and C. N. Steffens, D. D., President of Dubuque German Theological College.

FRIDAY EVENING

Types of American Colleges.

The Present Day American College—John H. T. Main, Ph. D., President Grinnell College.

The Independent College in our Educational System—Wm. Arnold Shanklin, D. D., President Wesleyan University.

The Place and Function of the Denomination College in Education—Wm. H. Crawford, D. D., President Allegheny College.

The Woman's College—Wm. W. Guth, Ph. D., President Goucher College.

Discussion led by Gustav A. Andreen, Ph. D., President Augustana College, and T. M. Hodgman, LL. D., President Macalester College.

SATURDAY MORNING, JANUARY 16

9:00 A. M.

College Efficiency and Standardization

The fundamental principles involved—S. C. Capen Ph. D., The United States Bureau of Education.

Report on a special investigation--Calvin H. French, D. D., Associate Secretary College Board of the Presbyterian Church of the U. S. A.

Collegiate education as a national problem--Elmer Ellsworth Brown, Ph. D., President of New York University.

Discussion led by J. H. Kirkland, D. C. L., President of Vanderbilt University, and Edmund C. Sanford, Ph. D., President of Clark College.

The program was carried out as announced with the following exceptions.

Commissioner Claxton was unavoidably detained in Washington, and the time assigned to him was devoted to an impromptu statement of the reasons for effecting an Association of American Colleges. Presidents Kelly, Fellows, and Cooper made brief addresses.

At the same hour, Director Geo. N. Carman of Lewis Institute spoke briefly upon the Junior College Movement.

On account of illness, President Shanklin had previously asked to be excused from taking his place upon the program Friday evening.

Owing to the pressure of business, President Kirkland and President Sanford courteously declined to take time in discussion on Saturday morning.

All addresses, save those of President McAfee and President Andreen, which at the time of going to press had not been returned to the Secretary, are printed in the pages that follow. The report of Dr. French has been typed and distributed in another form.

MINUTES OF THE ASSOCIATION

MEETING IN HOTEL SERMAN, CHICAGO
JANUARY, 14, 15, 16, 1915

THURSDAY, JANUARY 14
(Joint session)

One hundred and fifty college presidents united in joint session with the Council of Church Boards, Hotel Serman, Thursday evening at 8 o'clock. President Robert L. Kelly, Chairman of the Convening Committee and Vice-President of the Council of Church Boards, presided. Vice-Provost Josiah Penniman, of the University of Pennsylvania, led in prayer. The program was carried out as announced.

Speakers: Bishop McDowell, President King, and Dr. McAfee.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 15—MORNING SESSION

The Association met at 10 o'clock, and the proceedings were opened with prayer.

The report of the committee on temporary organization was presented by the chairman, President Howe, and adopted as follows:

President, Dr. R. L. Kelly, Earlham College.

Vice-President, Dr. John W. Baer, Occidental College.

Secretary, J. H. Kirkland, Vanderbilt University.

The officers took their seats.

President Kelly presented a message of regret from Commissioner Claxton and introduced the subject assigned him, discussing the aims and purposes of the new organization. The subject was further discussed by Drs. Cooper, Fellows, and others. The remaining subjects of the morning were taken up according to printed program.

Dr. W. F. Crafts made a statement concerning a volume of Bible readings for college use.

The Association adjourned.

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Association met at 2 P. M., President Kelly in the chair.

Dr. Crawford offered a resolution which was adopted, as follows: That a committee of five be appointed to consider the advisability of a change in the classification of American colleges and universities from the standpoint of control, and that this committee be requested to report at the session to-morrow morning.

The constitution previously prepared by the committee was taken up, amended, and adopted item by item and as a whole, as follows:

THE CONSTITUTION

THE PURPOSE of the Association shall be the consideration of questions relating to the promotion of higher education in all its forms, in the independent and denominational colleges in the United States which shall become members of this Association, and the discussion and prosecution of such questions and plans as may tend to make more efficient the institutions included in the membership of the Association.

NAME: The name of this Association shall be the "Association of American Colleges."

MEMBERSHIP: All colleges which conform to the definition of a minimum college given in the By-Laws may become members of this Association. Colleges which do not conform to this definition may become associate members without vote.

REPRESENTATION: Every institution recognized as a member of this Association shall be entitled to representation in each meeting of the Association through the President or Chief Executive Officer of the institution, or other accredited representative. Any officer being a member of the faculty or Board of Trustees of any institution belonging to this Association, or any officer of a Church Board co-operating with such an institution shall be entitled to

all the privileges of a representative excepting the right to vote. Each institution recognized as a member of this Association shall be entitled to one vote on any question before the Association, the vote to be cast by its accredited representative.

OFFICERS: The Association shall elect a President, a Vice-President, a Secretary and Treasurer, who shall be charged with the duties usually connected with their respective offices and who shall serve one year, or until their successors are duly elected. The Association shall at the same time elect two others, who with the three officers above named shall constitute the Executive Committee of the Association. The election of officers shall be by ballot. The term of office shall be for one year, beginning at the close of the annual meeting, and the President, Vice-President and the two members of the Executive Committee shall not be eligible to succeed themselves. The President or Chief Executive Officer of any institution connected with the Association may be elected to office. The President of the Association shall be *ex-officio* Chairman of the Executive Committee.

MEETINGS: At least one meeting of the Association shall be held in each calendar year. Special meetings may be called by the Executive Committee, provided that four weeks' notice of same be given each institution connected with the Association. Representatives of eleven members of the Association shall be necessary to form a quorum for the transaction of business.

BY-LAWS: The Association may enact by-laws for its own government not inconsistent with the provisions of this constitution.

VACANCIES: The Executive Committee is authorized to fill vacancies *ad interim* in the offices of the Association.

AMENDMENTS: Amendments to the foregoing constitution may be offered at any regular annual meeting, and shall be in writing, signed by the mover and two (2) seconds. They shall then lie on the table until the next an-

nual meeting, and shall require for their adoption the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the members then present.

BY-LAW NO. 1 was adopted, as follows:

In order to be eligible to membership in this Association, institutions shall require fourteen units for admission to the Freshman class and shall also require 120 semester hours for graduation; but the latter requirement may be waived by a two-thirds vote of the Association.

BY-LAW NO. 2 was adopted, as follows:

The annual dues shall be five dollars per member.

The following resolution was offered by Dr. Harker, and adopted:

RESOLVED, That the Association of American Colleges approves the constructive program of Christian education as suggested by the Council of Church Boards of Education, especially that part of it which relates to the interdenominational nation-wide campaign in the interest of colleges, and the Association pledges its active support in the plans proposed by the Council for putting the suggested program into effect.

(For outline of plan submitted by the Council of Church Boards for the Campaign, see footnote page 13).

The President of the Council of Church Boards of Education suggested that the Proceedings of the Association might be published in connection with the Church Board publications, but it was voted that the Association publish its own proceedings separately.

By unanimous vote Clark College was declared eligible to membership in the Association.

The following resolution was adopted:

That we instruct the Secretary to make the briefest summary of the actual business for the record and incorporate in this only the addresses formally announced and presented.

It was voted that a committee be appointed to report next year on state aid to denominational institutions.

The assigned topics of the session were taken up and papers presented according to the printed program.

The President announced the following committees:

State Aid in Denominational Institutions:

President Bell, Drake University.

President Dickie, Albion College.

President Hixson, University of Chattanooga.

President Culbertson, Emporia College.

President Hansel, Fargo College.

Classification of Colleges from the Standpoint of Control:

President Crawford, Allegheny College.

Dean Dinwiddie, Tulane University.

President Nollen, Lake Forest College.

President Hollis, Worcester Polytechnic Institute.

President Nicholl, Bellevue College.

Time and Place of Meeting:

President Morgan, Dickinson College.

President Smith, Washington and Lee.

President Sabin, Milwaukee-Downer.

President Chase, Bates College.

President Guth, Goucher College.

Officers:

President McKenzie, Elmira College.

President Hayes, Mt. Holyoke College.

President Murlin, Boston University.

President Wolf, Park College.

President Evans, Ripon College.

The Association then adjourned.

EVENING SESSION

The Association met at 8 P. M. President W. A. Shanklin was absent on account of illness. With this exception the printed program was carried out.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 16

The Association met at 9 A. M., and the exercises were opened with prayer.

In beginning the discussion of his subject, Dr. Capen read a letter from Commissioner Claxton, and in concluding his paper he presented the following resolution, which was adopted:

RESOLVED, That the Association of American Colleges appoint a representative to serve as a member of a committee, to which bodies named below will also be asked to send representatives, to discuss with the U. S. Commissioner of Education the advisability of classifying colleges according to their standards and equipment and, if deemed desirable, to decide upon methods of rating and to co-operate with the U. S. Department of Education in preparing classified lists:

New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland.

Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States.

North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

Association of American Universities.

National Association of State Universities.

American Medical Association.

Association of American Law Schools.

Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education.

United States Bureau of Education.

It was voted that a representative be appointed in accord with the foregoing resolution.

President Donald J. Cowling of Carleton was afterwards appointed.

The committee on classification of colleges presented its report, which was referred to a new committee consisting of Drs. Bell, Dabney, Nicholl, and Nollen.

Dr. French presented his paper according to the program. It was voted that Dr. French's paper be printed.

On motion this vote was reconsidered and Dr. French was requested by vote to consider and investigate these matters further and report next year; also to send typewritten copies of this report to all members registered.

On motion of Dr. Fellows it was voted that the Secretary of this Association and a committee of two be appointed to collect the necessary facts and statistics for complete study or survey of the colleges which are members of this Association.

The report of the committee on classification was adopted as follows:

It is recommended that the Bureau of Education in its reports classify colleges and universities as follows:

1. Tax Supported:
 - State.
 - Municipal.
2. Non-Tax Supported:
 - Church Control.
 - Church Affiliation.
 - Independent.

Dr. E. E. Brown read his paper according to program.

The following resolution was adopted:

MOVED: That the name "college" should be restricted in educational circles to institutions devoted to higher education and offering one hundred twenty hours after secondary education as a requirement for the first degree in Arts. That what are now beginning to be called Junior Colleges be called in our publications Institutes. That legislation should be sought to prevent the present abuse of the historic and honored designation of institutions of higher education.

On motion it was voted to lay this matter on the table.

The Nominating Committee presented the following Nominations:

President, President Robert L. Kelly, Earlham College.
Vice-President, President George E. Fellows, James Milliken University.

Secretary-Treasurer, President R. Watson Cooper, Upper Iowa University.

Additional members of the Executive Committee:

President Henry C. King, Oberlin College.

President Hill M. Bell, Drake University.

Being instructed by vote so to do, the Secretary cast the ballot of the Association for the officers named, and they were declared elected.

The Committee on Time and Place recommended that the next meeting be held at Oakland, California. It was voted that the next session be held in midwinter, at some place between the Alleghenies and the Rocky Mountains,—more definite selection of time and place to be left to the Executive Committee.

Dr. Cochran requested endorsement of the efforts of Church Board to secure second class mailing privileges for the Board's publications. On motion this endorsement was given.

The Secretary was authorized to publish the minutes without approval of the Association.

It was voted that the next program committee leave more time for discussion.

It was voted that annual dues be paid before February 15, 1915.

The Association then adjourned.

[Signed]

J. H. KIRKLAND,

Secretary.

The outline plan for a constructive program of Christian education as presented to the Association for their judgment and approval is summarized as follows:

1. Each secretary is expected to take up with his board, and, through his board, the supreme judiciary of his church, the whole question of Bible instruction in the public and high schools, to the end that these judicatories may express their views and take such part as they may deem wise in the effort to secure such instruction.

2. The Committee on Relations with Other Bodies is the representative of this Council to co-operate with the Commission on Education of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, and similar bodies, in a definite movement to improve the character of Bible instruction and religious education in general in Sunday schools, schools, and colleges.

4. The inter-denominational campaign which is proposed is to include:

(a) A general survey of the field, state by state, not for one but for all the denominations, in order to secure definite information of conditions and needs and to be the basis of a definite program for each church in behalf of its own institutions.

(b) A campaign of publicity through printed matter designed to be preparatory to a nation-wide inspirational campaign to awaken interest in the whole cause of Christian education whether conducted by the home, the local church and its organizations, the church school and college, or in connection with state institutions.

(c) A follow-up campaign to be conducted by each denomination for the purpose of increasing the income and patronage of the colleges.

(d) A continuation committee to carry on the work thus begun for a period of not less than five years.

5. The framing and execution of this program in its details is to be left to the Committee on Comity and Co-operation, and they are empowered to proceed whenever they have assurance that this general program meets with the approval and will have the co-operation of three-fourths of the church boards which constitute this Council.

On motion Secretary Thomas Nicholson was instructed to arrange for the proper presentation of the matter outlined in this summary to the Association of American Colleges and the Conference of Church Workers in State Institutions.

(For minute of interpretation of the resolution in approval of this program, see minutes of Executive Committee, following this footnote.)

EXCERPTS FROM MINUTES OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Cincinnati, February 25, 1915.

Chicago, March 20, 1915.

Time and Place of Next Meeting of the Association:

The next meeting shall be held January 20, 21, and 22, 1916; Hotel Sherman, Chicago, Illinois.

Policy of Association as Regards Membership and Activity:

On motion of President King it was voted that a "Policy of inclusiveness and inter-helpfulness rather than exclusiveness," be regarded and announced as the policy of the Association.

Minute of Interpretation:

"That the approval by the Association of the proposed Campaign in the interest of Christian Education, and the pledge of the Association to lend its active support is interpreted as implying the most sympathetic attitude on the part of the Association and the encouragement of individual members to co-operate."

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION

President:

Robert L. Kelly, Richmond, Indiana.

Vice-President:

George E. Fellows, Decatur, Illinois.

Secretary-Treasurer:

R. Watson Cooper, Fayette, Iowa.

Additional Members of Executive Committee:

Henry Churchill King, Oberlin, Ohio.

Hill M. Bell, Des Moines, Iowa.

Representative on National Committee on Standards:

Donald J. Cowling, Northfield, Minnesota.

State Aid in Denominational Institutions:

President Bell, Drake University.

President Dickie, Albion College.

President Hixson, University of Chattanooga.

President Culbertson, Emporia College.

President Hansel, Fargo College.

MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION

The asterisk (*) indicates that the college was represented at the meeting in Chicago, January 1915, and registered as present.

*Albion College	Albion, Michigan
*Alfred University	Alfred, New York
*Alma College	Alma, Michigan
*Baker University	Baldwin, Kansas
*Baldwin-Wallace College	Berea, Ohio
*Bates College	Lewiston, Maine
Baylor University	Waco, Texas
*Beloit College	Beloit, Wisconsin
*Bellevue College	Bellevue, Nebraska
*Berea College	Berea, Kentucky
Bethany College	Lindsborg, Kansas

*Bible College of Missouri Columbia, Missouri
 Bridgewater College Bridgewater, Virginia
 *Butler College Indianapolis, Indiana
 Brown University Providence, Rhode Island

Campion College Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin
 Campbell College Holton, Kansas
 *Carleton College Northfield, Minnesota
 *Carroll College Waukesha, Wisconsin
 *Carthage College Carthage, Illinois
 Central College Pella, Iowa
 Central Wesleyan College Warrenton, Missouri
 *Clark College Worcester, Massachusetts
 *Coe College Cedar Rapids, Iowa
 *College of Wooster Wooster, Ohio
 *Colorado College Colorado Springs, Colorado
 Connecticut College for Women New London, Connecticut
 Converse College Spartanburg, South Carolina
 Cooper College Sterling, Kansas
 Cornell College Mount Vernon, Iowa
 Creighton University Omaha, Nebraska

*Dakota Wesleyan University Mitchell, South Dakota
 Davidson College Davidson, North Carolina
 *Defiance College Defiance, Ohio
 *Denison University Granville, Ohio
 *De Pauw University Greencastle, Indiana
 *Des Moines College Des Moines, Iowa
 *Dickinson College Carlisle, Pennsylvania
 *Drake University Des Moines, Iowa
 Drexell Institute Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
 *Dubuque German College Dubuque, Iowa

Earlham College Richmond, Indiana
 *Ellsworth College Iowa Falls, Iowa
 *Elon College Elon College, North Carolina
 *Emporia College Emporia, Kansas
 *Eureka College Eureka, Illinois

*Fairmount College Wichita, Kansas
 *Fargo College Fargo, North Dakota
 Fisk University Nashville, Tennessee
 Forest Park University St. Louis, Missouri
 *Franklin College Franklin, Indiana
 Franklin College New Athens, Ohio

- *George Washington University Washington, D. C.
 *Goucher College Baltimore, Maryland
 *Grinnell College Grinnell, Iowa
 *Geneseo Collegiate Institute Geneseo, Illinois
 *Graceland College Lamoni, Iowa

 *Hamline University St. Paul, Minnesota
 *Hanover College Hanover, Indiana
 *Hastings College Hastings, Nebraska
 Haverford College Haverford, Pennsylvania
 Hendrix College Conway, Arkansas
 *Henry Kendall College Tulsa, Oklahoma
 *Highland Park College Des Moines, Iowa
 *Hillsdale College Hillsdale, Michigan
 *Hiram College Hiram, Ohio
 Hobart College Geneva, New York
 *Hope College Holland, Michigan
 *Huron College Huron, South Dakota

 *Illinois College Jacksonville, Illinois
 *Illinois Womans College Jacksonville, Illinois
 *Illinois Wesleyan University Bloomington, Illinois

 *James Milliken University Decatur, Illinois
 *Jamestown College Jamestown, North Dakota

 *Kalamazoo College Kalamazoo, Michigan
 *Knox College Galesburg, Illinois

 Lake Erie College Painesville, Ohio
 *Lake Forest College Lake Forest, Illinois
 *Lawrence College Appleton, Wisconsin
 *Lebanon-Valley College Annville, Pennsylvania
 Lehigh University South Bethlehem, Pennsylvania
 Leland Stanford Jr. University Stanford University, California
 *Lenox College Hopkinton, Iowa
 Lincoln University Lincoln University, Pennsylvania
 *Lombard College Galesburg, Illinois
 Louisiana College Pineville, Louisiana

 *Macalester College St. Paul, Minnesota
 *Maryville College Maryville, Tennessee
 McKendree College Lebanon, Illinois
 McMinnville College McMinnville, Oregon
 *Midland College Atchison, Kansas
 *Milton College Milton, Wisconsin

- *Milwaukee-Downer College Milwaukee, Wisconsin
 Missouri Valley College Marshall, Missouri
 *Monmouth College Monmouth, Illinois
 *Morgan College Baltimore, Maryland
 *Morningside College Sioux City, Iowa
 *Mount Union College Alliance, Ohio
 *Mt. Holyoke College South Hadley, Massachusetts
 *Muskingum College New Concord, Ohio
- *Nebraska Wesleyan University University Place, Nebraska
 Northwestern College Naperville, Illinois
 *Northwestern University Evanston, Illinois
 *Oberlin College Oberlin, Ohio
 *Ohio Wesleyan University Delaware, Ohio
 Oriental University Washington, D. C.
 *Ottawa University Ottawa, Kansas
 *Otterbein University Westerville, Ohio
- *Palmer College Albany, Missouri
 *Park College Parkville, Missouri
 *Parsons College Fairfield, Iowa
 *Penn College Oskaloosa, Iowa
 *Pennsylvania College Gettysburg, Pennsylvania
 Pomona College Claremont, California
- *Randolph-Macon College Ashland, Virginia
 *Randolph-Macon Woman's College Lynchburg, Virginia
 Rice Institute Houston, Texas
 *Richmond College Richmond, Virginia
 *Ripon College Ripon, Wisconsin
 *Rockford College Rockford, Illinois
 *Rose Polytechnic Institute Terre Haute, Indiana
 *Rutgers College New Brunswick, New Jersey
- Salem College Salem, North Carolina
 *Simpson College Indianola, Iowa
 *Southwestern College Winfield, Kansas
 *Southwestern University Georgetown, Texas
 *Southwestern Presbyterian University Clarksville, Tennessee
 St. Stephens College Annandale, New York
 *St. Olaf College Northfield, Minnesota
- *Taylor University Upland, Indiana
 *Temple University Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
 *Transylvania University Lexington, Kentucky
 Trinity College Durham, North Carolina

AMERICAN COLLEGES

19

Tufts College _____ Tufts College, Massachusetts
 *Tusculum College _____ Greeneville, Tennessee

Union College _____ Schenectady, New York
 *University of Southern California _____ Los Angeles, California
 *University of Chattanooga _____ Chattanooga, Tennessee
 University of Denver _____ Denver, Colorado
 University of Notre Dame _____ Notre Dame, Indiana
 *University of Pennsylvania _____ Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
 *University of Rochester _____ Rochester, New York
 *University of the South _____ Sewanee, Tennessee
 *Upper Iowa University _____ Fayette, Iowa
 Ursinus College _____ Collegeville, Pennsylvania

Washington and Jefferson College _____ Washington, Pennsylvania
 *Waynesburg College _____ Waynesburg, Pennsylvania
 Wesleyan University _____ Middletown, Connecticut
 Wellesley College _____ Wellesley, Massachusetts
 Wells College _____ Aurora, New York
 *Western College for Women _____ Oxford, Ohio
 *Westminster College _____ Fulton, Missouri
 *Westminster College _____ New Wilmington, Pennsylvania
 Western Reserve University _____ Cleveland, Ohio
 *Wheaton College _____ Wheaton, Illinois
 Whitman College _____ Walla Walla, Washington
 Whittier College _____ Whittier, California
 Wilberforce University _____ Wilberforce, Ohio
 *Worcester Polytechnic Institute _____ Worcester, Massachusetts

York College _____ York, Nebraska

THE CHRISTIAN IDEAL OF EDUCATION.

WILLIAL FRASER McDOWELL, BISHOP OF THE METHODIST
EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

Mr. Chairman and very dear Brethren: I count myself happy, first of all, to be invited to be present, and to consider with you this very important and serious matter. I shall speak as a former college president, as the president of the board of trustees of one of our own universities, and as president of the Board of Education of my own church. I do not speak primarily as a Bishop in the church. I was not always a Bishop. I led a perfectly respectable life for years, as I have been in the habit of saying, and easily remember the high estate from which I have come.

I suppose, Mr. President, that we could hardly consider the ideal of any kind of education, state education or Christian education, without taking some small account, at least, of the history of the movements for the different kinds of education. Into that history of course, it is not necessary for us to go, except for the purpose of starting ourselves upon the matter that we have in hand just now. Why did we set going any colleges or universities under religious auspices, ever in the history of the world? What was behind all that vast movement? What was behind it, in any country? What was particularly behind it here in America? The answer would be, of course, without answering in deep and elaborate detail, that the founders of those colleges that we call Christian had it in their minds to do something that was in harmony with the churches which are called Christian, and in harmony with the homes that were called Christian. They had it in their minds not simply to train a Christian ministry, and give it a higher education. They had it in their minds to train a Christian laity as well, and to furnish, under the influence

of religion, that type of character that is represented in the Christian schools.

Now, a little more definitely, after thus stating in the large, the historic basis, what is the ideal that should be before us? I wonder if it is not necessary to make the distinction between the ideals that are before us, and those that should be? I wonder sometimes if it is not necessary for us, about once in so often, to redefine our own ideals. Has Christian education become a subject with us, or is it, as it ought to be, an object with us? A good many years ago there was a young minister who was asked not infrequently by his young wife the subject of his next Sunday's sermon. He would usually tell her what the subject was going to be. She became interested in the subjects of his sermons, as she ought to have been; but one week she very nearly revolutionized the universe for him, not by asking the subject of his next Sunday sermon, but by asking the object of it; and she never again asked primarily about the subject. I wonder if we do not need once in a while to define to ourselves the objects that are before us in Christian colleges; if, for instance, at the beginning of a year, it would not be a wholesome discipline for president, faculty and trustees,—not to mention students—to set out before themselves very clearly what they intended to try to do during the year upon which they were entering?

Now, if we were going to do that, I suppose that we should come upon certain things like this: The ideal of Christian education is not a thing that can be stated in a single sentence. It is a much richer and more full and elaborate thing than you put in a word; but it must surely embrace these, and possibly other distinct features: First, this is our ideal: To conduct the youth committed to us through the period of collegiate or higher training, under Christian influence and Christian care. Has there been a distinct reaction in our American institutions against the old theory that the college stood in *locoparentis*? Have we pretty generally repudiated the idea that the col-

lege stands in the relation of the parent, in the place of the parent? Have we allowed the democratic, self-assertive spirit of youth, its unwillingness to submit to certain kinds of restraint, its normal desire for liberty, to cause us to abandon completely the theory of the parental relation?

Brethren, the misfortune of asking a man past fifty years of age to speak to you is that his memory goes back a little farther than the memories of most of you, and he is just as likely as not to say that in a certain very real sense, namely, in the sense of exercising an influence and a care, that have the spirit of Christ in them, the college never can repudiate the parental relation and face its Master, after having had the youth of the world in its hands. Of course, it is not ours to tell a boy when he shall put on his rubbers, and when he shall take them off; but it is ours to supply that kind of influence and care, and to exert, if we may, that kind of influence and care upon the youth committed to us, that will harmonize with the spirit of the Church which founded us, and the home that trusted us, and the Lord and Master to whom we are alike accountable. Is that not true?

I suppose, also, that this ideal must include the teaching of the various subjects that must be pursued in all kinds of institutions, from the Christian point of view and in the Christian atmosphere. I am just as familiar as you are with the flippant sneer that there is no such thing as a Christian geometry; and from my recollection of my own experience with all higher mathematics, I am disposed to agree. I am as familiar as you are with the flippant sneer that there is no such thing as a Christian this and a Christian that. I am perfectly willing to admit all that is true there as well as elsewhere. I do not quite admit, however, that the interpretation of literature, the interpretation of history, the interpretation of philosophy, the interpretation of science, or the interpretation of anything else much, for that matter, may be just from any point of view whatever. That there is such a thing as a Chris-

tian point of view, that there is such a thing as Christian basis, I think we must all hold. That there is such a thing as a Christian atmosphere, in which all subjects are studied, is surely one of the primary ideals of the Christian college.

I should suppose, also, in the next place, that it would be our ideal, while we have youth committed to us, to conserve the faith and ideals brought by those students to the college. Often it is a very crude and untrained faith. The intellectual basis of the faith that many a boy takes to college is a thing that the flippant could make merry over, that those who are regardless of such things could easily jeer at. Many a boy brings to college religious conceptions that have long since been outgrown in the college, just as a good many boys come to college wearing a style of clothing that is no longer fashionable in the college. There is such a thing as conserving that faith that he has brought, while making him over. You remember what William Newton Clarke, who was a real prophet to our generation, said about the duty of the Christian church. It ran like this: "It must keep faith, it must keep an open mind as regards all new truth; and it must enlarge its heart." Blessed be that institution that helps to conserve, not the crudeness of the faith the boy brings, but the reality of it, during the period when he is receiving the inevitable wounds of reflection. Blessed be the boy who does not have inflicted upon him in this period the wounds of somebody else's reflection in a reckless way, for there is a kind of heedlessness at times about those matters.

I have known an occasional man in a faculty, just as I have known an occasional minister in the pulpit, who enjoyed shocking simple souls with their simple views. It does not seem to me to be a very enjoyable thing. As members of my own church know very well, I speak as one of those who have the largest sympathy with all reverent progress in the way of thinking. I am not a reactionary, as the members of my church here present

know. But no boy in a Christian college ought to be compelled to endure wounds recklessly inflicted. This faith of his is to be conserved, not its crudeness, nor its mistaken intellectual basis; but the simple faith itself is to be conserved through this period, which is a period in which the boy will receive enough of the wounds of reflection; and he will receive what is a good deal more serious, the wounds of temptation under new conditions. The wounds that temptation inflicts upon the youth in college are wounds that we do well both to avoid and to heal. Allow me just a personal word from my own experience, and pardon my speaking to you in this frank and simple way. In the old days when I was secretary of the Board of Education, I was starting off one autumn day to visit the Conferences. I went to say good night to my daughter, for I was to leave in the early morning before she was awake. Of course, I had said good-bye to her two or three times in anticipation of my expected absence of six or seven weeks, but that did not matter. I have said good night to her mother many times in a single evening. However, I went to say good night to her again. I opened the door leading into her room gently and quietly, thinking that if she were asleep, I would not wake her. When I opened the door I found her kneeling by her bed in prayer for herself, her parents, her friends, the Church and the world. She would go to college before I got home. She was not entitled to anything that other girls were not entitled to. She was not entitled to anything because she was my daughter; but she was entitled when she went to college to that kind of care that would keep her through all the new things that she would learn without the destruction, but with the strengthening, of that simple faith in which she lived, and in which shortly afterwards she beautifully died.

Your men and women who are teaching are not fundamentally teachers of subjects; they are fundamentally teachers of persons. And the great passion of the teacher should not be the passion of the language that he teaches, or the literature that he teaches, but the passion of the

life that he is shaping, with language and with literature.

I suppose, also, that it would be agreed that we must increase the faith of our students by the true values that we bring to them. Faith ought to grow upon truth; faith ought to grow upon knowledge. Those old definitions that were purely flippant, which said that faith consists in believing what we know is not so, have no place in the college; but the faith of the youth ought to be strengthened by the larger truths that the college brings to the youth. That, surely, is a proper ideal for a Christian college.

I suppose, also, that it would be true to say that it is one of our ideals to hold and to create loyalty to Christianity, along with intellectual and academic freedom. In the Christian college, of course, we are tempted all the time at the point of denominational control restraining us, tempted to feel that that means we shall not assert our right to think, and our right to teach. Freedom of thought, freedom of inquiry, and freedom of teaching lie at the very basis of any sound education. But freedom alone does not lie at its basis as a solitary fact. Freedom lies at the basis along with loyalty, and not at all along with recklessness. It is the freedom, not to do just what anybody pleases, that we prize, and must forever insist upon, but the freedom that is free in the truth which has set us free; and loyalty to Christ must always be held along with our firm hold upon freedom.

There has been a kind of reaction against sectarianism. I suppose that all of us are just a little bit ashamed of being denominationalists. We sort of half apologize in our catalogues for anything that squints toward it. All the catalogues insist that the institution is thoroughly Christian and non-sectarian. And in not a few cases the desire to escape the imputation of being sectarian has taken the whole edge off the evangelistic and Christian spirit in the institution. It has been non-sectarian, not as between different bodies equally believing in Jesus, but non-sectarian as between Christianity and anything else under heaven; and that is not non-sectarianism at all. So that

we are to hold our freedom and liberality toward one another first, on the basis of our absolute loyalty to Jesus Christ.

Surely this also is one of our ideals, or ought to be. This is the nub of all I am wanting to say: The idea of making youth, while in college, Christian if it is not Christian when it comes to college. I cannot escape the influence that surrounded me in the days when I went to college. I cannot while I live cease to be grateful, not that I fell into the hands of someone specially designated to do it, not that I fell into the hands of an Association secretary who had in his hands the whole working of the Christian life of the institution, but that in those old days at Ohio Wesleyan I fell into the hands of a Faculty, which Faculty felt itself under a divine compulsion to do what it could do to induce young fellows like me, who had come to college without having given themselves to Jesus Christ, to give themselves to Jesus Christ. The evangelistic agency for the college student, brethren, should not be turned over to anybody with a raw method, a raw theology, and everything else. These are our children now in our hands, and it is for us, God helping us,—I must use the plain term—to bring them to Christ, if we can, and to lack nothing in the way of effort that shall accomplish that thing. Of course, we are to teach them; of course, we are to do this, that, and the other thing; but unless we try to bring them to Christ we are losing our supreme effort. I succeeded in the secretaryship a certain man who was president of Ohio Wesleyan for eleven years, I think, before he died. I suppose that, on the day we buried him, it would be a fair thing to say that by his personal efforts he had led more than a thousand students in that institution alone to give themselves to the Christian life; and had at the same time increased the material resources of the institution, and raised its standards of scholarship every year.

I must not say more, except this: Here is the principle, the basis of membership of the Young Women's Christian Association, the purpose of it: "To lead stu-

dents to faith in God through Jesus Christ." Should we do any less? "To lead them into membership and service in the Christian church." Should we do less? "To promote their growth in Christian faith through the study of the Bible." Should we try to do less? "To influence them to devote themselves in united effort with all Christians to make the will of Christ effective in all human society, and to extend the kingdom of God throughout the world." Should we do less? The aim of the Christian college should be to develop the best scholarship in the world, and the best teaching in the world. We must do that as well as it is done anywhere else in the world. The prayer meeting, as I have said repeatedly, is no substitute for a library, and a Christian Association is no substitute for a library; and there is no substitute anywhere for the Christian spirit and activity of that body of men and women who constitute the teaching body in an institution. You would not turn the intellectual life of the institution over to anybody else; and I cannot see that we are justified in turning the religious life of the institution over to anybody else.

Brethren, we have come in the matter of our life to such a crisis as the Christian colleges never faced in this world before. Years ago I was riding through Ohio one day with a very distinguished jurist, the late Judge Lemon, of Toledo, a member of the Protestant Episcopal Church. I was a very young man, and still had my enthusiasms with me. I still have a lot of them. I had not reached the point where I was too foolish to ask large questions. And as I talked with this great, wise man, I turned to him and said: "Judge, tell me, what is the most important and the most difficult thing in the world?" He smiled, and I smiled. At last he said: "That is a large question, but I will answer it. The most important thing in the world and the most difficult thing in the world is to make the mind and the spirit of Jesus prevail in the world." If Christianity breaks down as a world force, it will break down because the Christian colleges are inadequate in the

day of trial. Never did Jesus Christ need the right kind of Christian college in His world as He needs that Christian college today.

THE CHRISTIAN IDEAL IN EDUCATION: METHODS OF ITS ATTAINMENT.

HENRY CHURCHILL KING, PRESIDENT OBERLIN COLLEGE.

Since the "Christian ideal in Education" evidently cannot mean simply religious education, but rather a permeating of the whole aim and process of education with the Christian spirit, it is clear that that ideal cannot be something quite isolated from common educational thinking. If that be true, we can be certain that all justified methods for the attainment of the Christian ideal of education must fulfill at least three basic conditions: First, they must be passed upon the fundamental laws of human nature. For it is with that human nature that all education has to do; and the Christian man must think of the laws of that nature, as an expression of the will of God in creating men, which will he has no right to disregard. Second, the methods must be based upon a clear insight into what the aim of education is. For the Christian college has no right to substitute a sham process for a real one. Third, that aim of education being ascertained, the methods must be such, as can honestly fulfill that aim, under the guidance of the highest ideals known,—and therefore, for the Christian man, under the guidance of Christian ideals—the ideals and standards of Christ. And if the Christian ideal of education has any right to prevail, the Christian educator should be able to see not only the closeness of relation of the various aspects of the aim of education to the teachings of Jesus, but also that these aspects naturally find their culmination in meeting the demands of Jesus. I do not know how more fully the Christian ideal of education could be attained. I am assuming in my further discussion, that college education is primarily in mind.

I. First of all, then, the methods for the attainment of the Christian ideal of education must be based upon the

fundamental laws of human nature. I have already treated so fully this aspect of the subject in my paper on "The Primacy of the Person in College Education," in the book on Personal and Ideal Elements in Education, that I must content myself here with quoting from that paper a bare summary of methods, intended to be drawn directly from what have long seemed to me the outstanding emphasis of modern psychology: the complexity of life; the unity of man's nature; the central importance of will and action; and the concreteness of the real, leading to emphasis on the personal.

"The proper fulfillment of the function of the college, this seems to indicate, requires as its great *means*, first a life sufficiently complex to give acquaintance with the great fundamental facts of the world, and to call out the entire man; second, the completest possible expressive activity on the part of the student; and, third, personal association with broad and wise and noble lives. And the corresponding *spirit* demanded in college education must be, first, broad and catholic in both senses,—as responding to a wide range of interests, and looking to the all-round development of the individual; second, objective rather than self-centered and introspective; and, third, imbued with the fundamnetal convictions of the social consciousness. These are always the greatest and the alone indispensable means and conditions in a complete education, and they contain in themselves the great sources of character, of happiness, and of social efficiency. The supreme opportunity, in other words, that a college education should offer, is opportunity to use one's full powers in a wisely chosen complex environment, in association with the best;—and all this in an atmosphere, catholic in its interests, objective in spirit and method, and democratic, unselfish and finely reverent in its personal relations."

The methods here suggested, based on the fundamental laws of human nature, are not only antagonistic to Christian ideals, but are, point by point, in strictest harmony with such ideals.

II. In the second place, the methods for the attainment of the Christian ideal of education must be based, as we have seen, upon clear insight into the aim of education. What is the aim of education? Why do the schools and definitely attempted education exist at all? Education perhaps might be said to be the organized way in which society seeks to answer the insistent, inevitable, even tho half unconscious questions which the growing individual puts to the race: What are you trying to do? How far have you got? Where can I help? That is to say, education is ideally intended to enable the individual truly to see the direction and the problem and tasks of the world's work; personally to share in the great intellectual and spiritual achievements of the race, so far as the race has gone in the solution of its problems and in the accomplishment of its tasks; and to secure from the individual his own fresh reaction upon these world facts and tasks, and so help him to find himself, and to make his own largest contribution to the progress of the race.

The same result may be reached in a slightly different way. Man is the "educable animal," capable of indefinite growth through experience—his own and others. So that Findlay naturally says, "Thus man has risen, it would appear, to his higher levels by two stages: first of all, he is found able to profit by *past* experience; secondly, he has immensely advanced in means of *communicating* experience, utilizing the experience of the best for the common good." Hence one of the first and greatest reasons for education is enlargement of experience,—to enable the individual to share in the achievements so far made by the race. "Schools are maintained because men want children to set their affections on what is best."

But this experience of the past cannot be taken over in a merely passive way and unchanged by the individual. The present is no mere replica of the past, but has its new duties and opportunities, and progress is made by men seeing things freshly and from new points of view. The individual himself, too, is not truly educated until he comes

to insights and values and choices of his own. Findlay may therefore well say that there is a "life-long struggle between convention and freedom, and one function of the school is to give fair scope for this spirit of independence."

Education, thus, is seen to have two great functions: the enlargement of experience, and to give free scope to the individual spirit of independence, and even to develop it.

Now in whatever way one reaches this conception of the aim of education, it plainly involves two outstanding methods: fellowship and individual independence; and education insistently requires both. Herrmann's summary of the moral law is therefore at the same time an admirable statement of the essential methods of education:

"Mental and spiritual fellowship among men, and mental and spiritual independence on the part of the individual, that is what we can ourselves recognize to be prescribed to us by the moral law. Each of the two is a particular expression of what is morally good. We ought at every moment to make the rule of our conduct this: Thou shouldst throw thy whole being into the effort to attain the profoundest and most far-reaching fellowship with other men that is possible; and at the same time this also: Thou shouldst be inwardly independent, and in virtue of that truly alive. Both of these propositions go together, for only by willing what we ourselves recognize to be eternally the final aim of all things can we regard ourselves as independent beings, and so as free masters of the circumstances in which our existence is placed. On the other hand, the mental and spiritual fellowship which we are obliged to conceive of as the final aim is possible only among independent beings. For whoever lacks inward independence has nothing in him that he can give to others. In that case he may indeed, as a thing, serve as a means employed by others. He renders this service even without taking any notice of it. He means to exploit others and is being exploited by others. Fellowship with them he can have none."

Herrmann elsewhere draws both moral and religious corollaries from this general principle, that are highly suggestive for education also: "We all need moral help from others, but not the substitution of a ready-made list of duties for the results of our own thinking." "Religious tradition is indispensable for us. But it helps us only if it leads us on to listen to what God says to ourselves."

Now this elaborated statement of Herrmann's is only a modern echo of Jesus' old words: "Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt have lost its savor, wherewith shall it be salted?" For these words characterize his own two supreme methods: the contagion of the good life, and the insistence upon utter inner integrity, fundamental soundness, in the individual disciple.

These two fundamental and indispensable methods I have undertaken to develop in the chapter on "The Method of Life," in my *Religion as Life*. I have there attempted to show that the way into all the values of any kind is essentially the same way: First, we are commonly introduced into any given value through the testimony of those who have preceded us in appreciation of the value—fellowship in this conscious introduction. This is the very business of the literary and art and musical critic, of the friend, and of the moral and religious seer,—the very business of the teacher himself. Second, there is required on the part of the individual both the absolute honesty of independent judgment, and openminded modesty,—honesty, that there may be no sham at any point; modesty, that the individual may not too readily conclude that his own experience has exhausted the values in any given realm. Third, and as summing up all: staying persistently in the presence of the best in the sphere in which one seeks attainment, with honest response. Here are both fellowship and individual independence. Now these are methods, fundamental in their nature, and therefore everywhere applicable. They concern, too, the very essence of education, and are through and through Christian at the same time. For they are but the two sides of that reverence

for personality, that is only the expression of Christianity's sense of the priceless value and inviolable sacredness of every individual person; since this involves inevitably both self-respect—*independence*, and respect for the personality of others—*fellowship*. These methods cannot fail to be, then, methods for the attainment of the Christian ideal education. The college life should be continuously characterized by mental and spiritual fellowship, and by mental and spiritual independence on the part of the individual.

III. The methods for the attainments of the Christian ideal of education, in the third place, must honestly fulfil the aim of education under the guidance of Christian ideals, and must be able to see that the different aspects of the educational aim find their culmination in meeting the demands of Christ. If formal education is what we have called it—society's organized attempt to answer the growing individual's necessary questions directed to the race: What are you trying to do? How far have you got? Where can I help?—and the rational adjustment of the individual and the rational progress of the race as well both seem to require just this—then education should at least give to the individual some genetic understanding of the civilization in which he lives; and bring him also into some personal sharing in the great intellectual and spiritual achievements of the race, corresponding to the great departmental tasks and sides of man's nature. And if the Christian ideal for human life is a truly adequate one, it should be able not only to include these aims of education, but show that in its ideal these aims find their natural culmination.

Our western civilization is in the direct line of intellectual, moral, and religious descent from ancient Greece and Rome and Judea. Our roots in philosophy and literature and art go back to Greece (and in less degree to Rome), in law to Rome, and in religion to Judea. We shall not understand ourselves if we forget them. We are fond of quoting Bacon's saying to the effect, that we are the ancients because the last generation has always the ad-

vantage of a larger experience than any generation that has preceded it. But we should remember that we can make this claim to be the ancients, only if we have entered with some real understanding and personal appropriation into what the past has accomplished. The very idea of a scientific evolution has compelled us to recognize that we cannot truly know anything, except as we know it in its growth. Certainly, there can be no true understanding of our own time without knowing it genetically. The college may be held therefore as bound to introduce its students to the significance of the great lines of inheritance of western civilization—Greek, Roman and Judea. Doubtless the modern college cannot give the same proportionate amount of time to Greek and Latin, for example, as the older college did; but it ought to insure in some vital fashion—perhaps through live courses in Greek, Roman, and Jewish literature in English, and through Greek, Roman, and Jewish and Christian history—that its students are not cut off from the rich lessons to be learned from the profoundly significant experience of the Greek and Roman and Jewish peoples as related to modern life and problems. If one has at all the Christian's faith in a divine Providence in history, the Christian ideal of education will certainly be felt to include such a genetic understanding of our time. The task of the Christian college is not otherwise honestly fulfilled.

But education requires not only that one should genetically understand his time; he must also be able to enter intelligently and unselfishly into the life and work of his own generation; and that he cannot do without coming into some personal sharing in the great intellectual and spiritual achievements of the race. For our own time we can have no doubt, that this requires that the college should help its students to some genuine personal sharing in the scientific spirit and method, in the historical spirit, in the philosophic mind, in esthetic appreciation, in the social consciousness (including some insight into economic and social and political conditions) and in religious discernment

and commitment. This general requirement indicates the main lines of the college curriculum, but it calls for much more than mere acquaintance with the facts in these various realms. It sees clearly that the educational goal is not reached in any of these realms without a personal sharing in the corresponding spirit; and that this sharing in the spirit is the vital matter. Such personal sharing demands at each point both fellowship and individual independence. Every one of these great outstanding characteristics of our time, too, is very closely related to that Christian spirit that should inform the whole life of the Christian college, and culminates, indeed, in a spirit directly demanded by Christ.

First of all, if the Christian college is honestly to fulfil the aim of education in this age, it must make possible to its students some personal sharing in the scientific spirit and method—perhaps the most outstanding inner characteristic of our time. It implies wide and patient and systematic study of the facts, and insight into laws—natural, economic, political, social. Without such insight, and the obedience which should follow from it, there can be no true discipline of education. Huxley's definition of education has permanent truth: "Education is the instruction of the intellect in the laws of nature—under which name I include not merely things and their forces, but men and their ways; and the fashioning of the affections and will into an earnest and loving desire to move in harmony with those laws." But such insight and obedience are possible, because back of both there is the scientific spirit itself the determination to see straight, to report exactly, and to give absolutely honest reaction upon the situation in which one finds himself.

And this attitude has a genuine moral quality that is unmistakable, and that the Christian college must clearly recognize and distinctly teach. Indeed, it may be doubted if there is anywhere so close an historical parallel to the requirement for the scientific spirit, as in the insistent demand of Jesus for utter inner integrity. His passion for

reality everywhere, his insistence that men must come to insights and decisions and choices of their own, and his abiding hatred of sham—all only carry into all life what the scientist requires in one realm. This whole great aspect of modern education surely thus finds its natural culmination in the demand of Jesus upon the inner man.

The historical spirit might almost be said to be simply an application of the scientific spirit. It is the ability to put oneself, with vivid constructive and detailed psychological and sociological imagination and insight, at the point of view of the other man of the race, of the other time and clime, and to see things through his eyes, from his point of view. It is an essentially modern phenomenon—in any thorough-going sense hardly more than a century old; but it has profoundly influenced our estimate of most important interests, as the historical criticism of the Scriptures, and the whole growth of comparative religion bear witness. And from none of this need the Christian college shrink. If the historical spirit is genuine at all, it should help us in this day, when races are being mingled as never before and civilizations are clashing, in the overwhelming task of the conquest of race-prejudices and race-contempts and race-hatreds. Now the historical spirit requires, beyond doubt, at every point of historical judgment, a moral quality,—exactly the quality demanded by Jesus in every application of the Golden Rule in the entire range of life, and inevitably involved in his whole great contention of the priceless value and inviolable sacredness of every man. The Christian college should find it no strange and unwelcome task to carry through to its culmination in all its work the historical spirit.

Nor is a man educated who quite lacks the philosophic mind. For men cannot permanently remain satisfied simply to study the immediate connection of things in their mechanical explication. Men need to see life steadily and to see it whole, to ask ultimate questions, and to inquire as to life's ideal interpretation and its final meaning. No age has needed the philosophic mind more than our own—

so complex, so transitional, so revolutionary. No age more than our own, with its stupendous resources of power and wealth and knowledge, requiring to be dominated by ideal ends, has needed this large and comprehensive interpretative survey. And in all this final interpretative task, philosophy comes inevitably to essentially religious questions. The kinship is unmistakable. It is not by accident that the Christian college has so commonly emphasized philosophy; for philosophy has never been able to feel its task completed, until it included great affirmations essentially religious in their implications and sweep. The full answer of religious faith is needed to enable philosophy to reach its goal of a completely rational world. If the faith of Jesus is accepted, it answers as nothing else can, humanity's deepest questions, and profoundest longings. The Christian college here too may carry to its culmination another great trend of human nature, and give what the philosophic mind seeks.

There is another great realm of human achievement that no adequate education can leave out of account—the realm of esthetic appreciation. The educated man must come to some real personal sharing in the appreciation of the beautiful in nature, in literature and music and art. For natural reasons this has been perhaps a point of especial weakness in American education. And yet how deeply significant esthetic appreciation is, is forced upon one by various lines of thought. Esthetic interests make for the balance and sanity of even the most earnest college life. It means much that men have so instinctively and habitually associated the true, the good and the beautiful. The fact that the great method of coming into all these spheres of value is the same method of staying persistently in the presence of the best with honest response, is almost suggestive of the close kinship of the esthetic to the moral and religious. The frequent profoundly moving and thrilling power of the beautiful can hardly be understood at all except upon Lotze's hypothesis that the beautiful, so clearly seen in a mere fragment of the world where

we had no right to expect it, seems to us a kind of divine prophecy and promise of the ultimate harmony of all. This sense of the beautiful, too, thus finds its natural culmination in religious faith. The Christian college cannot fulfill its function and ignore this divinely implanted esthetic instinct in man.

It is still more clear that a man does not belong to the modern age who has not shared in the social consciousness. It peculiarly characterizes this age and, imperfectly as it has been manifested, it is still the age's chief glory. The Christian college has certainly not completed the education of a student whom it leaves untouched by this spirit of the social consciousness. And it must be confessed that our higher institutions of learning have at this point too often lagged behind and even proved reactionary. And yet nowhere more than in this essentially moral task, is the race working out the problem of social progress. It has still much to learn of complex conditions and laws—natural, economic, political, social—but it knows something at least of its ideal and goal, and knows the essential method of the scientific mastery of its problems, realm after realm. There can be no doubt that the social consciousness is most closely akin to the Christian spirit. For its insistence on the essential likeness of men, on their inevitable and indispensable mutual influence, and on the sense of the priceless value and inviolable sacredness of the individual person—all this is only a modern translation of Jesus' essential faith that every man is a child of God. It has applied in detail and in the entire realm of society, the principle of Jesus that he that is greatest shall be servant of all. The Christian college ceases to be Christian, so far as it fails in the social consciousness.

Finally, no imperative upon the race has been felt more keenly or more persistently, than the demand for religious discernment and commitment. Man has been truly called "incorrigibly religious." Even when he has scouted religion, he is found clinging to some poor substitute for it. Man is made on too large and too high a

plan to find his needs met in simple irreligion. We have seen how naturally and even inevitably the other outstanding racial tasks look on to an essentially religious goal. And the Christian college believes most of all, of course, in the fundamental nature of religion; that man must finally ask ultimate questions; that there can be no permanent meaning and value to life without the conviction of an infinite purpose of good back of the universe, without faith in a heart of love in all life. For, as Eucken says, so characteristically for our own time, "Not suffering but spiritual destitution is man's worst enemy."

By methods no less broad and far-seeking than these, is the Christian ideal in education to be achieved.

THE PLACE AND FUNCTION OF THE PROPOSED ASSOCIATION.

ROBT. L. KELLY, PRESIDENT OF EARLHAM COLLEGE.

President Kelly: The topic before us this morning is the place and function of the proposed Association; and in the absence of Commissioner Claxton we may appropriately spend a few moments in considering that phase of the general topic. You will pardon me, perhaps, if I occupy a little time. There have been certain doubts expressed in reference to the advisability of an organization of this kind. It has been suggested that we do not seem to have any very definitely outlined policy; that the purpose of the organization is expressed, if expressed at all, in somewhat vague terms; and the question is asked, "What do you hope to accomplish by an organization of this kind?" One of the well known educational men of the United States said to me, in a conference upon the subject, "Well, if you get this organization formed, the college presidents of the country will at least have one other place to go." One of the college presidents of New England made the objection that New England has an Association of Colleges, and it does not seem worth while to join in an American

movement. A college president in New York wrote to the same effect, and suggested that probably the colleges of the central west had a number of problems which were sufficiently alike in their nature to justify an organization of this character, but he did not believe that it could be national in scope. The suggestion has come from one of the college executives of the south that there is an association among the southern colleges, and that it is scarcely worth while for the southern institutions, therefore, to join in a national movement. From such criticisms as these, it appears, gentlemen, that so far as educational matters are concerned, we have not yet risen above sectional lines. Politically we have become a nation; educationally it seems that there is still a considerable amount of state and sectional feeling. Now, one of the purposes on an association of this sort undoubtedly would be to wipe off the map any such things as an educational north, south, east or west. There was a time in the history of the American Republic when a man stood up in the Senate of the United States and boasted that he came from South Carolina, and was interested chiefly in the problems of South Carolina; and there has been a time in the history of American politics when men have made the same sort of statement regarding the States of Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and others. It appears, therefore, that in the world of education, we need to get a larger vision as politically we have already done.

Then this objection has been raised, that we have too many kinds of institutions for a functioning body. It is true, of course, that we have colleges in this country that are well endowed, and colleges that have no endowment; we have colleges with high educational standards, and we have colleges with low educational standards; we have colleges which vary one from the other in a multitude of points. There is neither time nor need to catalogue the many differences. It is said that in the midst of such conditions we cannot have a national organization. And yet, gentlemen, in other lines than educational work that

is just exactly what America has done, and is doing. Many of our citizens are of German, Italian, and Bohemian descent. We have within the limits of our country Puritans, Knickerbockers, Cavaliers, Cowboys and Hoosiers. We have among us Hebrews and Catholics, Mormons, Mohammedans and Methodists. We have Republicans, Democrats and Socialists. We have indeed a great conglomeration of citizenship, from one point of view; but above all and beyond all we have American citizens. There is such a thing as an American spirit, as the soul of America. Now, the question has been raised: Why should not the colleges, which are the formative centers of our civilization, the institutions that preeminently will make or mar this country, join in interpreting the meaning of this genius of America, in fostering its development, and in determining to some extent its destiny? We differ in many things, educationally, and in many other respects; but fundamentally as Americans, we are all alike, and our problems are all alike. Take a New Yorker, a Catholic, a Cowboy, a Socialist, and an Americanized Bohemian, and they possess certain fundamental things in common. They possess a sense of self-reliance, a desire for fair play, a limitless fund of energy, a desire for order and social cooperation, and an ambition for self realization; and these are the traits, or some of them, at least, which we may call distinctive American traits, and which our colleges should join in fostering. The things which we have in common are more numerous than the things which separate us. How much war would there be today if Europe had a European spirit rather than a German spirit, an English spirit, and a French spirit. Shall we not glory in the fact that we have an American spirit, and that we who are here have been placed in positions of responsibility, such that we may help in guiding the destinies of America as we foster that spirit?

It seems to me—and I think that all agree to this—that advance is made as we socialize larger and larger groups; and the fundamental purpose, perhaps, of this

organization is that we shall become a social solidarity, so far as our higher institutions of learning are concerned,—those institutions not under state control. We have been treated with a splendid view of what the possibilities of a united effort are in the vigorous and successful work which is being done by the mission workers, not only of this country, but of the world, under the leadership of John R. Mott. We know what tremendous vitality was breathed into the educational situation in the south, as a few years ago the men of that section joined in a great educational revival. Many of you who are here this morning heard that statesman-like suggestion yesterday of Secretary Evans of the University of Pennsylvania. Secretary Evans called attention to the fact that the Y. M. C. A. has conferences at Northfield, Geneva, and other places; and the suggestion he made was this, that those conferences become not Y. M. C. A. conferences, but conferences of religious leaders in America, with members of the Y. M. C. A. members of the Church, and members of any other organizations that believe there is a fundamental need for the development of religion in this country. We have not yet developed a national educational consciousness; and in general terms the purpose of this organization is that we may do that thing.

Now, there is a more practical phase of this question. The leaders of the American Revolution were heartened by the fact that there had been an English revolution that had succeeded. The English revolution had worked, and our forefathers said, "Since that revolution has succeeded, we can have what we want in this country also." There is, as we all know, an Association of State Universities that has succeeded. Marked success has attended the efforts of the men who have joined together in that organization and the question is raised: What the State Universities have done in their way, cannot the non-taxsupported institutions do in their way? It is the belief of the promoters of this organization that that question should be answered in the affirmative; and to come down to the vital

point, in answer to the question as to why we are attempting to organize an association of this kind, perhaps it might be said that if the American colleges do not hang together, they are likely to hang separately.

R. WATSON COOPER, PRESIDENT OF UPPER IOWA
UNIVERSITY

Mr. Chairman, I will try to be as brief as possible. But you put me in the dangerous position of not having known that I was to speak, and then ask me to talk upon a topic that for five years has been weighing upon my spirit, and is still weighing heavily. I wish to call your attention very briefly to these several facts: First, there is already a program outlined for the educational development of America. This program was accepted by the National Educational Association, in a report made three years ago, as the ideal to work towards. It excludes any satisfactory consideration of the American college, and looks finally toward the elimination of everything strictly collegiate, unless it be the possible admission, in a very uncertain manner of two years of college work. The scheme is: Six years of primary work covering our present six grades; six grades of high school work, three years of which shall be in the junior high school and three years in the senior high school. The intent is that the sixth year high school student shall be a college Sophomore in point of development. This plan was reported to the National Educational Association, adopted by that Association, approved and published by the Bureau of Education at Washington, and is now accepted as the authorized ideal of public Education. This has all been done without the concurrence of any group of colleges, without any consensus of opinion or judgment from them. The colleges desire to consider the effect of this reorganization of education upon them, and the need either of securing a modification of this program or of adjusting themselves to it.

Just one fact worthy of note; the period that the Council of Church Boards is chiefly concerned about, the period of moral and spiritual awakening, the period of great moral and spiritual development, is the period now covered by the last two years of the present high school course and the first two years of the present college course. The high school is not caring at all for the religious life of that period; the state universities are paying little attention to it, and the colleges are not paying as much attention to it as they should. The freshmen in both state institutions, and independent colleges are the last to be considered; our best teachers are reserved for our higher classes. Understand, I am speaking now of a general not a specific condition. The attempt to throw this entire period of spiritual awakening and mental development into the high school and thus entirely eliminate the agency of the college; and at the same time the manifest tendency on the part of our American Colleges to neglect this opportunity for significant service to our young men and women,—perhaps the most characteristic service they can render, is a matter of importance to America and of concern to this body.

Secondly I wish to call your attention to another fact. It is at present not only natural but almost necessary that the state institutions assume, that a definitely determined educational system in America, excludes the American College as any part of it. I do not mean that the colleges are marked for destruction or elimination, but that with a few exceptions they have not had and do not have any statutory or administrative recognition in the system of education in the United States. We are an "aside" and in the plans and programs of American Education are beginning to be considered an interference. A study of the legal and statutory standing of the colleges in the various states of America, made by myself two years ago, shows that the independent colleges of America have generally no statutory recognition, save such as they secure in charters, or in the articles of incorporation, recorded in the county

in which the college is located. This is true in Iowa, and I find that the Iowa situation is repeated in many other states of the Union. Any three men in Iowa who see fit to do so can formulate a scheme for a college, can promulgate articles of incorporation, get them recorded at the county seat, and announce themselves as ready to grant baccalaureate and other degrees. In the first place this practice ought to be stopped, and ought to be stopped now. The initiative to get it stopped, and to secure proper statutory recognition, for the colleges of America, ought not to come from the high school men or from our state universities. It ought to come from this body of men, or from the leading colleges in the various states where the colleges here represented are located. The colleges must act where the colleges are concerned. In the second place the colleges should seek and obtain both statutory and administrative recognition in the scheme of public education everywhere. In order properly to accomplish this, the colleges must be organized and at work. We need state organizations and a national organization, a common program and accepted and announced ideals and aim.

Thirdly, I would speak of another fact, of no less significance than the two already mentioned. The fact is this: The educational system of the United States is now in the hands of the high school men of the country. The pronouncement of educational ideals for all America is made by and left to the Department of Superintendence, which meets this year in Cincinnati on the 22nd of February. In watching the attendance at the meetings of the National Educational Association and the Department of Superintendence, I find that with the exception of Columbia University, Chicago University, and one or two other of the larger independent universities that have strong departments of education, there are very few men representing the independent colleges present in these gatherings where our educational ideals are formulated. Unless there is a change in habit before the Department of Superintendence meets at Cincinnati in February, the super-

intendents of our larger high schools and representatives from the departments of education will again meet and determine educational ideals and movements for the nation. The conclusions they pronounce, the educational scheme they outline, is the outline and the plan towards which the entire educational system of this country gradually sets itself. But the colleges will not be there. But is it not time the colleges were playing in this larger national game? Whether there is to be finally a four-year college course, whether there must be a new program for our colleges; whether there needs to be a new adjustment of ourselves to meet the newer demands of life; whether some of us, if not all of us, should so refunction our courses or redirect our education, as to give ourselves a new standing in the community, and a new appeal to the public, these and other questions should be considered by us before they are settled for us by forces outside the colleges. They seem to me to be subjects worthy of the highest consideration, and worthy of an annual meeting of the college presidents of this country. This meeting need not simply provide the college president another place to go and another opportunity to spend his time; rather it will become his opportunity to help formulate the educational program and ideals of the United States, and of the various states here represented.

We cannot live alone any longer and do so safely,—at least in the central West. Eight normal schools in the state of Wisconsin will become colleges if the colleges do not get into the game in Wisconsin. I do not mean merely that they must individually do good work, but they must become a part of the system, and secure recognition from the state. Five normal schools in the state of Minnesota will become colleges if the colleges do not secure recognition as a part of the educational system in the State of Minnesota. Twenty colleges in the State of Iowa will find themselves facing an educational program which will assume that they are not a part of the educational system of Iowa, if they do not insist now upon their proper re-

cognition. There is a definite call for this association in the Central West. Perhaps that section of America lying east of the Alleghenies does not yet need to admit that there is anything determinative west of the Allegheny Mountains. I am an alumnus of a New England College and still honor New England leadership very highly, yet I think that we should have a National Association of American Colleges. And I also think that New England will join us, in the persuasion that we are building for the nation and not for ourselves, and are only now beginning to do the duty that we are called upon to do.

I have no desire to ring an alarm bell, for I am not frightened. I am only anxious for an advance among the independent colleges that they may together assume this larger task and accomplish it. I highly honor the American College; but as a citizen of America, I am persuaded that if the colleges do not get together for this larger work, the state must march on without us.

GEORGE E. FELLOWS, PRESIDENT OF JAMES MILLIKIN
UNIVERSITY.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: I regret exceedingly that if I were to be called upon at all, I could not have been forewarned, not because I could have made a better speech—my personal vanity is not such that it makes any difference about that—but because the scope of this subject is so great that if I had been forewarned I might perhaps have put together a few facts and a few experiences in better form than I can possibly do now, on the spur of the moment. It has been what I believe to be my good fortune that I have been connected, first with the University of Chicago during its formative period in the nineties, and next with a state university, for many years, since that time; and now with the class of institution represented by the attendance here in this room. It has given me opportunity to study the educational situation from a number of points

of view. While he was building up the University of Chicago, and developing his ideals as they were to be carried forward, I had the opportunity to hear the ideas of President Harper, much lamented,—an able and great man. From what he said, and what I knew of his views, he thought that such universities as the University of Chicago, Harvard, and others, might supply the educational needs of their respective vicinities in the higher educational field, if the colleges—or, as he called them, the small colleges—were to do but two years of the work then undertaken.

In fact, he already had published his views giving the idea that there was really no place for the college, except by giving half its course.

I was with state universities during what might be called the formative period of their Association,—not the formative period of the state universities, because individually many of them had become great long before the Association of state universities became powerful and influential. The first meeting of the Presidents of state universities which I attended had but five members present, I think. The next year there were nine, and the next year an increased number; and one year before I withdrew from the state university work, the two greatest state universities, or two of the greatest, that had longest held out against such an Association, feeling that it was unnecessary, Michigan and Minnesota, applied through their Presidents for admission to the Association of State Universities, much to the pleasure of all of us. These applications clearly proved that such great institutions as Michigan and Minnesota could not afford to be out of the organization which was promoting the welfare of state universities. Now, they are all in, and they all help each other. It is trite now to make an argument for "the college." I agree with the protest which was made at the Illinois Teachers' Association a couple of weeks ago against the use of the expression "small college." We need no adjective. It is not necessary to say "small college, as distinguished from "great university," for they are not the same thing; the

college and the university are two things. I need not argue that; you all know it. Nor is there any necessity of entering upon an argument for the existence of the college. We heard that last night, and we have heard it on all occasions when men representing the body we represent get together. That is finished. It is established. The colleges are not to be killed off. They have grown more vigorously and powerfully ever since President Harper's first investigation and pronouncement on that subject; and have grown right here in Illinois, right under the eaves of the University of Chicago. So that consideration is out of the way.

The only question to consider, now, is the question of expediency and policy in forming the organization. It is trite to say that this is an age of organization. It is only by organization nowadays that we can accomplish great results. Believing as we do that the colleges represent actually the strongest arm of the educational body, is it wise for them longer to lack the influence and inspiration of the kind of organization which has made colossal world enterprises of certain businesses, and which has made also a colossal public enterprise of state university education? We cannot afford longer to be without it. Now, how do we get benefits directly from organization? The general proposition is theoretical, of course; but it is that organization is better than individual action in many ways. But how may we get the benefit from organization which the state universities have gained? It is not merely through the interchange of ideas which have been presented at the meetings of State University Presidents, that the Universities have profited. We have heard some of the greatest educational programs presented in those meetings that have ever been presented anywhere in the history of education. No man can sit for two days annually in those meetings without receiving an inspiration which can scarcely be obtained elsewhere. I am extremely proud that since I have ceased to be actively engaged in state university work, I am permitted by the courtesy of the

Association to enjoy an honorary membership, so that I may attend annually those meetings; and I would not dispense with that privilege for anything. But that is not all. It is not alone hearing the views of men who are able, capable and experienced. It is getting the kind of inside information which cannot be obtained otherwise. I am confident that the members have profited more from the annual collection of facts and statistics which have been presented to them, first, for their own use, privately collected by the secretary, with the rest of the world knowing nothing about them; and later taken up by the Department of Education in Washington, and presented in a larger and better way. They have gotten more from the information contained in those bulletins of statistics than they have from the Association meetings and the addresses that have been made. Say that Arizona, New Mexico, Kansas or Oklahoma has a unique problem to present to its legislature. If it has the experience of forty-two universities—forty-one besides its own to draw from, so that it may know just how much money is being appropriated, how much is being paid the professors, how much the buildings are being increased or decreased, et cetera, it has a weapon of tremendous force with which to attack the money providing power, the legislature. It is not alone a case of the large helping the small, for the big ones profit by the experiences of the little ones; for some little universities have accomplished great things along certain lines, and their experience helps the others.

Now, if there are forty-two of those state institutions in their organization, and that organization is so effective for that number, how much more could a similar body of two hundred men, representing two hundred institutions, here assembled, accomplish for the improvement and management of those institutions? I believe that inasmuch as we outnumber the members in the State University organization, so in the same proportion may we each profit by the experience of others. I have no doubt that many times there occur to you such questions as these:

How do such and such colleges, which are about the size of the one I represent, handle this particular question? What support do they have? Do they present such and such matters to the Board? Is this the Board's business, the president's business or the corporation's business?

We know nothing about what the others are doing—almost nothing. Annual reports, where they are published, serve a certain purpose as far as they go; but my earnest hope is, if this Association is formed—as I believe it will be—and will become a power—that we shall honestly represent on paper, for each other, all of the things that we do, so that we may all profit by what the others are doing. That is a matter I wish to take up and press if we form the organization. It would avail little if we met annually and merely harangued each other with our own experiences, ideals and ambitions. The one thing that we have been accused of is lying in our catalogues. Unconsciously, I suppose, we do lie, but it is unconsciously done. No man of the standing of you gentlemen would willfully lie in his catalogue; so if we do lie, it is because we do not know any better, and because we are a little fearful that the other fellow will "put it over" on us if we do not keep up with him. Now, if we can find out, by honest correspondence with each other, just exactly the facts, there will be no need of any of us telling anything that is more than the truth, and nobody will have an unfair advantage. Furthermore, we shall be helped in every detail that we have to handle by a close knowledge of how the more successful ones deal with their problems. It is not at all unlikely that Cornell, Beloit, or Upper Iowa should profit by the experiences, in many lines, of Williams, Amherst and Wesleyan. Neither is it at all improper that some of the colleges which have become great, if not famous, in the East, should profit by some of the experiences of the newer fresh-water colleges, so-called, out here, like those represented by men who are right here before me.

Gentlemen, the cause of education which is represented by the college, as distinguished from every other

kind of institution, cannot afford to let go longer the opportunity or the tremendous force that the proper kind of organization can effect.

GEORGE N. CARMAN, DIRECTOR OF LEWIS INSTITUTE.

Mr. President and Gentlemen: I feel confident that we who are interested in higher education are facing a great opportunity. I am in hearty accord with what has been said by the three speakers to whom you have listened this morning. Some of you know that I have some excuse for appearing before you at this time when this topic, that has been so emphasized in these addresses, is under consideration. As in the case of President Fellows, I was closely associated with the late President Harper. He was one of the managers of the Lewis Institute, of which I am the director. Most of you know that for twenty years we have done the work of the junior college; and you can understand why we have done that, in part, because you are familiar with President Harper's aims as they were presented here this morning.

In the report of the Carnegie Commission on Vermont, the junior college and the junior high school are recommended. Twenty years ago we organized at Northwestern University the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. For twenty years we have been meeting annually and have tried to establish closer relations between the colleges and the secondary schools of the North Central States. But present indications seem to point to the need of reorganizing our entire system of secondary and higher education, but I must not take the time to go into detail.

All I shall undertake to do is to say this: The conception of the secondary school that makes it cover a longer period, beginning at an earlier stage and going further, is meeting with such favor in so many different directions, that we must give it consideration; and we ought to welcome it, because it is the means, I believe, of solving many

of our most difficult educational problems, and the means of enabling all of us, whatever positions we hold, wherever our colleges are located, to better serve our respective communities and carry out the aims for which we stand.

The commissioner of education, in his address given a few days ago at Philadelphia, presented forcibly and clearly the fact that all over this land, with its increasing wealth, the country boys and girls are no better off educationally— if as well off—as they were a hundred years ago. Their condition may be remedied if we who are interested in higher education, whether secondary or college can agree:

(1) That the secondary work should begin at about the age of twelve, and that the junior high school should do in three years what it now takes four years to do in the last two years of the grammar school and the first two years of the high school.

(2) That there should be senior high schools, a junior college, accessible to every one in this country, who can take advantage of the opportunities offered, which should do in three years what it now takes four years to do in the last two years of the high school and the first two years in college.

Will this reorganization injure any college? No. There is no reason why every college should not help us to solve the problem. Where the work of a college should begin and where end should depend on its resources and the needs of the community which it serves.

The university of today may have its undergraduate department of four years, its graduate department of three years; it is perfectly right for a university to cover a range of seven years; we do not gainsay that. This work of the junior college should begin where many of the small high schools ought to stop and cover the last two years of high school and the first two years of college, and go on as far as its resources make possible.

As President King said last evening, let us find out what we are driving at, and where we are. Let us com-

bine, and have fellowship; and with that let us have independence, so that we may each do that which will best serve the youth of our fair land.

THE RELATION OF THE COLLEGE ASSOCIATION TO EXISTING ASSOCIATIONS.

STEPHEN B. L. PENROSE, PRESIDENT OF WHITMAN COLLEGE.

When I was asked to speak upon this subject, I had no knowledge of this organization. I was ignorant of its aim, its scope, and its self-imposed limitations. From the Far Northwest I drew my bow at a venture, not heeding what joints in whose armor I might pierce.

If it is not too late, the formation of such an organization as here is contemplated is very opportune. The American college has been exposed for a generation to the perils of popular misunderstanding and of certain educational tendencies which threaten its future existence. The time seems ripe when the distinctively American colleges should get together in an organization which will make clear to them their distinctive mission and to the public their permanent value.

I noticed recently an announcement that the high school in San Diego, California, would take on two years of college work. The announcement is significant of a tendency strongly marked in certain quarters to develop an American institution after the manner of a German gymnasium. There is a tendency also on the part of certain post-graduate schools in some American universities to require for admission only two years of so-called undergraduate or college study. If these two movements develop unchecked the American college will find its life ground out between the nether millstone of high school development and the upper millstone of a Teutonic conception of higher education and of life.

But the American college is the only institution which the United States has invented and contributed to the

science of education. Its destruction or gradual elimination will mean much to American education, both practical and theoretical. The consequences of such an elimination will be far-reaching. The American college needs to recognize these threatened perils.

The time, secondly, is ripe for such an organization as is here proposed, because of the recent criticism to which American colleges have rightly and wisely been subjected. After a long period of haphazard and careless development, the colleges of the United States have been brought up with a round turn through the criticism of various educational experts, primarily the Carnegie Foundation. Books and magazine articles have demanded the reorganization of the American college, and it has been scrutinized as never before.

The advantage of such an organization as this seems to me fundamentally two-fold. In the first place, it will bring the American colleges to self-consciousness, to a clear understanding of their distinctive educational position, their historical significance, and their essential pedagogic methods. This awakening of a class-consciousness will be the first great step toward class-improvement. The demand for high-grade efficiency can only be made by individuals or institutions who have come to self-consciousness, who are aware of their own significance, their strength, and their weakness. The recognition of our deficiencies is an indispensable step to improvement.

In the second place, it will hasten the process of self-standardization. I say "self-standardization," for I think that an important distinction needs to be made between a standardization which is a conforming to the measure of standards set up by outward authority, and a voluntary self-initiated standardization which springs from the earnest attempt to attain one's own ideals. It has been charged that the American colleges have been sluggish in the past, that their teaching has been inefficient, that their care of their students has been neglected, that their moral and religious ideals have been forgotten, and that they may well

be absorbed into high schools on the one hand and universities so-called on the other. I hope that this organization will serve to clarify the aims and to define the educational place of the American colleges until he who runs may read the lesson of their permanent importance. It has been encouraging within the last few years to feel an occasional breath of air, a mere passing whiff of appreciation for the college as a distinctive American institution. These light passing zephyrs will gather into a steady trade-wind if this organization fulfills its possibilities and helps the American college to attain its completest influence.

It is necessary that this association shall at the start differentiate itself from other associations of educational institutions with which it may be confused, if not entangled. The first of these is the existing Association of American Universities which, now fifteen years old, has gathered into a great and useful organization the larger universities of the United States.

What is a university? The question has never been answered in this country, and no satisfactory definition can be given in view of the looseness of American usage of the word. The universities in this association referred to have set two criteria, first, the quality of work done in their graduate departments, and second, the entrance requirements to those graduate departments. They recognize apparently that undergraduate work is not their characteristic function. No American university has dared to take a permanent stand upon the German platform that a university is solely and distinctively for advanced and research work. Our hybrid institutions are in part colleges and in part universities in the German sense. The suggestion of President Eliot made twenty years ago, that Harvard University should some day abandon Harvard College and make itself distinctively a post-graduate institution, has fallen upon deaf ears. I doubt whether any American university will have the courage for such an undertaking, but meanwhile it is fortunate that our best American universities are recognizing that their distinctive

function is post-graduate rather than undergraduate work. May the time speedily come when the entrance requirements which they maintain for their post-graduate departments shall be sufficiently advanced so that they will not admit students fresh from high school who have not had the broadening and cultural development of a thorough undergraduate education.

On the other side of us are such organizations as the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Southern States, now fifteen years old, and the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. I select these organizations as typifying institutions from which I think it is important that we should dissociate ourselves. The connection of the preparatory school with the American college is at present pedagogically indefensible. While our high school system was weak and secondary education needed the stimulation, there was sound argument for maintaining preparatory schools under the eaves of the American college, despite the inevitable influence of such preparatory schools upon the life and methods of the college. That day has passed. Except perhaps in some remote corner of a sparsely settled country there can be no justification now for the union under one roof of two institutions so separate in their ideals and methods as the preparatory school and the college. If we are to bring the American college clearly before the American people as an institution distinct in its aims and methods, worthy of perpetuation because standing for something clearly distinguishable and desirable, we must draw a line of demarcation between the college and the preparatory school, and we must do this not only for the sake of the college, but also for the sake of secondary education as well.

I know that I shall provoke opposition, and that probably many of the institutions represented here will strenuously defend the pedagogical value of an academy in connection with a college, and will protest against my position as theoretic and quixotic. To them I can reply that I have

tried both plans. Three years ago Whitman College abandoned the academy which during fifty years had been an indispensable part of the institution. We did so after careful consideration, for reasons which seemed good although possibly perilous, and we did so at one stroke, terminating the life of the academy and throwing the college for its material upon the high schools of the Pacific Northwest. The result was in every way happy. On the one hand the high schools entered into a new conception of their relations to Whitman College. Formerly they had thought of it as in some way a rival, because students who might have come to them went to Whitman Academy instead. Now they conceived of it as distinctively a superior institution, which took their graduates and gave them four years of college work. The internal relations of the change were even more advantageous. The class of younger adolescents disappeared from the campus. The less earnest and more trifling students also disappeared. In the past what sporadic cases of discipline we had were almost entirely in the Academy. Since it has disappeared, need for discipline has itself almost disappeared. The development of student responsibility has been possible as never before, and student self-government is now practically, even though not formally, established. The number of college students has steadily increased, and the whole spirit of the institution has been lifted to a higher level.

In order to make clear my conception of the place and purpose of this organization, I offer the following recommendations. I think that it would be inexpedient to try to define a college, either in terms of scope or of wealth, and it would be equally inexpedient to emphasize the form of control, whether denominational or nondenominational. Without endeavoring to be over-precise, I recommend as follows:

- (1) That this organization be confined to institutions which have no graduate departments.
- (2) That it be confined to institutions which have no preparatory departments.

(3) That it be confined to institutions which require at least fourteen Carnegie credits for admission.

With these limitations, I would invite to membership all the colleges of the American continent. The influence of such an organization upon its members would be very great, for it would develop their self-consciousness and stimulate the process of their self-standardization. Its value to the outside world would be equally great, for it would help to demonstrate the abiding significance and worth of the American college.

If now, in conclusion, you ask me what should be the relations of this association to other associations similar in general character and aim, I reply:

(1) Hearty cooperation, the cooperation of friendly sympathy, of close communication, and of recognition that the many-sided problem of education is essentially one.

(2) Differentiation. The American college is not a university, and it is not a "Gymnasium," (though often alas! not so good). Let us make sure ourselves what we are, or ought to be, that the people of the United States may not misunderstand the American college.

SHALL THE DENOMINATIONAL OR INDEPENDENT COLLEGES ASK FOR STATE SUPPORT?

S. B. McCORMICK, CHANCELLOR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH.

There is no special reason why this topic should be assigned to me, nor am I conscious of possessing any peculiar qualifications for discussing it. The only possible one is the fact that I have a very real interest in the American college and a very exalted conception of its value and function in our system of education. For seven years, I was President of a church or denominational college. I am now the head of a University which depends chiefly for its support upon State appropriations, but which also receives appropriations from the city as well as gifts from private persons. I bring to the discussion of the problem,

therefore, only such knowledge as the above facts necessarily involve, unless a very sincere and exalted conception of the value and the function of the college be reckoned an additional qualification for the task.

My answer to the question is, No. It seems to me both unwise and inexpedient that State support should be sought or accepted on the part of the denominational or independent college. The reasons for this opinion are set forth briefly in this paper.

PROPOSITION I.

The independent college, which is usually the denominational college, has its own origin, history, and function, whose radical change or impairment would result in grave injury to our system of education. Organic relation with the State would impair this value.

With the origin of the college, every educator is familiar. For nearly two hundred and fifty years the first American college, now Harvard University, was a college, and nothing more. William and Mary, the second college established in America, so remains, and will doubtless continue as a college to the end of its history. Yale has assumed university function, but even today she is known throughout the land by her college, rather than by her university, function. From the earliest times until now, the independent college in America has, for the most part, been founded by the church. Those independently founded, by the gift of a single donor or of several donors, are in nearly every case recent in origin and few in number. This proposition refers, however, to the independent college, regardless of origin or earlier relationship. This institution usually known as the small college has a unique place in the historical development of our system of education.

This history reflects glory upon the American people. In a time when there were no public schools under it, and no universities above it, the college held high the lamp of learning and gave to the nation the leaders of thought in

every department of human activity. Until the rise of the university in recent years, it has been the chief custodian of the learning and the culture of the nation. The American university is only a generation old. Practically it did not exist until the founding of Johns Hopkins. When Charles W. Eliot became President of Harvard, it was a college only, without a graduate department and with professional schools simply in an affiliated relation. Until a generation ago, therefore, the history of higher education in America was the history of the American college. "Who's Who" contains the names of living men only, and therefore has in its list many young men who may be graduates of universities. The older men in Who's Who, if graduates, are alumni of colleges, and not of universities. An institution whose history is the history of the American college is one which should be preserved and perpetuated. Unless the college has lost its function, it should continue its historical and independent organization.

The need for the college in America is just as imperative now as at any time in the past. It was never an institution for the making of scholars, although it has been the fountain head of scholarship and has inspired great numbers of men to devote themselves to learning. It has always stood for culture and for character. It stands just as positively for culture and for character today. The need for culture and for character in the nation was never more imperative than now. America would lose much if the college should ever be less able to render its peculiar service to the nation. It must have no handicaps, no entangling alliances. It must be put under no control which, under any pretext or for any purpose, could interfere with or radically change its high and sacred function.

In expressing this conviction, with entire freedom and considerable emphasis, I am quite conscious of the fact that the college must perhaps undergo certain modifications and certainly must recognize the changes which are taking place in our educational system, if it is to render the largest measure of service to the whole people. How

far it will adapt itself to these changes the college itself must decide. The following facts confront us:

(1) A constantly increasing number of young men and young women are demanding better service on the part of the public school system for the only education they can receive.

(2) A more complete and efficient preparation is required for admission to the professional schools.

(3) The professional schools have increased vastly in their efficiency and are providing more varied and greatly multiplied courses required for the professions.

(4) Moreover, the professions themselves are rapidly increasing in number. No longer are there simply three learned professions.

(5) The graduate school is not simply pure research but is assuming largely the character of a professional school not only in teaching but in the practical application of science to industry.

The gradual emerging of this situation will inevitably compel a readjustment of the whole system of national education. One may approve or disapprove, but personal approval or disapproval is powerless to change or modify the inevitability of the situation. The world of affairs does not stop to consider theories or ideals of education, but it makes its own demands and these demands must be met.

East and West, North and South, the public school system, supported by public taxation, will, to meet these requirements, eventually superimpose upon the elementary course six years of the kind of study included today in the high school and the first two years of the college course. Just as inevitably, these six years will settle down into the preparation required ultimately by all the schools preparing for professional life. It does not matter whether this six-year period will be called a high school; whether it will be divided into two parts of three years each; whether it will be divided into two parts, leaving the present four years' high school unchanged, and adding two years,

equivalent to the junior college; or whether the six years will be divided into two periods, one the high school and the other a tax-supported college; or whether some other division may be made, and other names given. The fact itself is the only thing which is obvious. In other words, the larger communities of America will provide, at public expense, for all the youth who may wish to avail themselves of it, this amount of preparation for their life work, on the one hand, and for their professional study, on the other hand; and this amount of preparation will be accepted and required by the universities, as the preparation for their graduate and professional work.

Moreover, it is obvious that the State will come to provide completely for the education of American youth from the primary school to the university. The chief function of government is now educational, requiring for its own sake and for the sake of the people, both instruction and research for the training of men and women and for the solution of all problems affecting the well being of society.

If any one is disposed to believe that this evolution of the system of public education, whatever form it may assume and to whatever degree it may extend, will limit the function or lessen the value of the American college, I should strongly dissent from that opinion. On the contrary, it will make it more than ever useful and indispensable. The college should, perhaps as already intimated, so modify and so rearrange its curriculum as to be fitted more perfectly into the whole educational system. For two centuries the college stood by itself. Now, with the present development of the high school and the university, it stands by itself no longer. It should therefore learn as quickly as possible how best to adapt itself so as to be an integral part of the system and not a thing apart from it.

I mention two reasons only for my conviction that the college has a constantly appreciating value in American education.

(1) The increase of wealth always increases opportunity for leisure and for the pursuit of culture. This fact increases the need for an institution which stands for such an ideal. The American college is such an institution. As such it must stand upon its own foundation and be free to work out its own curriculum, uninfluenced by any consideration except the largest service in behalf of broad and liberal culture. The result will be, for instance, a revival of interest in Greek language and in Greek culture; in the history of government and of politics; in the study of philosophy and of literature; in fact, in the pursuit of all those things whose primary value is not in their practical application, but rather in the broadening of intelligence, the widening of human sympathy, and the inspiration to unrewarded public service. This process has, in fact, begun already and it is clear that it will continue until this ideal becomes the chief characteristic of the independent American college. The college will receive endowments in increasingly generous amounts from those who are in sympathy with this high function of this historic institution. The college should not be compelled to enter into any alliance which would lessen its power to serve the public thus beneficently. It seems too much to American character and culture to imperil its future by any act of expediency.

(2) The second service the independent college must render is scarcely less vital and important. I refer to its influence upon the college of the tax-supported university. Already the college has fixed itself so absolutely in the affection and confidence of the American public that not even a university has been able to establish itself without it. Johns Hopkins tried it, and failed. Clark University tried it, and failed. The heart of every university in America is its college. Nevertheless, the college of a university must of necessity find its chief function in realizing the broad and useful purpose of the university as such. Its courses of study, in no wise surrendering the ideal of culture and character, must of necessity further and promote

the practical ideal for which the university exists. That the university college may be held to the highest ideals of scholarship, unselfish service, public well being, finished culture and exalted character, it must have constantly held out before it the ideal set by the independent college. The university has thoroughly demonstrated, not alone its usefulness to the people, but its necessity to the State. The commonwealths of the nation must look to the universities for the solution of problems essential to every public interest. Research is no longer simply an accomplishment. It has become a vital fact in the national life. Trained men in the professions are not desirable. They are imperative. Hence the university. But that the university may not depart too radically from the ideal of culture, its college must continue to recognize and to foster such ideals. The independent college, pursuing its free course, must set and maintain these high standards and thereby contribute mightily to the educational progress of the people.

PROPOSITION II.

My second proposition is that the denominational college is the creation of the church, and as such has a distinct function which must of necessity be preserved from any State relationship.

As already intimated, the independent college is usually denominational in origin. So far as it retains its Christian character, it is usually denominational still in its history and in its sympathy. What I shall say under this proposition applies to all Christian colleges, whether their relationship to denomination is organic or sympathetic. The college founded in its earlier years nurtured by a religious body rarely disowns its parent. The original spirit ever environs it, invisibly shaping and directing its policy. The memory of the consecrated men who once guided its affairs usually holds the college true to the religious ideals of the past. The fidelity of the men who control it now also constrains them to loyalty to the fundamental faith of the church.

The denominational college of the present day is, however, for the most part in organic relation with some religious body. Of the sixty under the care of one great denomination, only two or three are independent in control, and they are permeated with the splendid spirit of the denomination. Moreover, of these sixty, not more than five were founded before the middle of the last century. They are therefore contemporaries of the great State universities, which have come into being within this same period. What is true of this one religious body is essentially true of all religious bodies, and hence true of the Christian college of America as a whole.

The religious idea and ideal which brought this institution into being are as vital and forceful now as they ever were. From the standpoint of more education, the church no longer needs to establish institutions of learning. The State is attending to this matter adequately. From the standpoint of religious education, however, the church should continue to maintain the Christian college. The idea has lost none of its significance. If not so many are needed now as in earlier years, it is just as imperative now that those which continue or which may be newly created should hold fast to the idea which gave them birth. If in any case there is no money to maintain it, the remedy is not to surrender the idea but the charter. This does not even admit of discussion.

If therefore a Christian or denominational college is to be, it must necessarily stand on its own foundation and maintain its absolute freedom of control. To accept State money would be as wrong on the part of the college as to give it would be wrong on the part of the State. If it is important that there be this kind of college, it is important that it should preserve itself absolutely and always from anything which might tempt it from its high and holy function of Christian teaching and Christian propaganda. While in the Protestant bodies the sectarian college has passed away, yet the statement applies just as positively to any institution which deems it a duty to inculcate any

form of religious faith and practice. The separation of Church and State is a fundamental American principle, and the American college should be the last institution to originate or to accept the benefit of any provision which might interfere with the operation of this cardinal doctrine. Deeply religious as are the American people, this religious spirit expresses itself in a multitude of denominational forms, resulting in the division of the people into an equal number of ecclesiastical bodies. If the college is to maintain its high Christian function, it must preserve itself immaculately from any charge whereby it may seem to open the door to the violation of a principle so essential to personal liberty and public well being.

It should be remembered also that the Christian college has demonstrated its value in the history of higher education. The influence upon the system of State education has been and will continue to be most distinctively beneficial. It is idle to indulge in speculations as to what might have been had something not happened which actually did happen. Theologians used to discuss the question as to whether God could answer that question. On the other hand, it is profitable sometimes to review what actually did happen, and to understand the significance of it. There was a period in the history of the State University when there was laxity on the part of teachers and students alike in matters of conduct and character, a laxity due in part, at least, to the absence of authoritative religious instruction. It was the denominational college which brought the State institution face to face with this tendency, and set it about to exercise care both in the matter of ethics and religion. The service thus rendered by the Christian college is unwritten but significant history. It is a service the college must continue to be in position to render, if the highest educational well-being of the nation is to be conserved. If it is worth while for the church to establish a college, it is for a reason which makes it imperative that that church should maintain the college. To preserve it, it should neither ask nor receive State support.

PROPOSITION III.

The third proposition is this: State support involves at least some measure of State control. Such control is inconsistent with independency on the one hand and with denominational control on the other. The statement of the self-evident proposition concludes the answer to the question proposed to me for this discussion.

The question whether the denominational or independent college should receive and administer funds committed to it by the State for some special purpose, for example the department of education, is not a part of the topic assigned to me, and hence is not considered in this paper.

DISCUSSION.

HILL M. BELL, PRESIDENT OF DRAKE UNIVERSITY
H. F. SLOCUM, PRESIDENT OF COLORADO COLLEGE.

President Bell;

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: I confess that after listening to the last address I was not sure that I would be justified in expressing my views upon that very important topic. My great respect for President McCormick and his judgment almost deterred me from giving you my own ideas, in apparent opposition to the conclusions which he reaches in the very able address to which we have just listened. In the discussions of this morning I should like to say in passing that there appears a very real need of an association of the presidents and executives of American colleges. It is seldom that in the course of an hour or two we hear so many dogmatic finalities stated. I am not sure, isolated as we have been in different sections of this country, and in our own communities, that we have a broad view of the whole educational situation, such a view as is really necessary if we are to develop a great system of education in America. I believe that the college presidents of the Middle West can learn a great deal from those of the West and those of the East and vice versa. I believe that all of us

can learn something from the conclusions that have been reached by the public school men who are leaders in that field of education today. We ought not to be in too much haste to see that the work of the college has been definitely fixed; that there should be no change. We are getting together now to begin to peel off our preconceived notions of what the college really is, and will be in the future.

I am not sure that the college is going to be harmed in the great work which it has set itself to do in the past, if it shall lose both its freshman and sophomore classes, and shall confine its attention to those who have finished these two years in the high schools of this country. I say, I am not so sure of that. I have heard both sides of this discussion; I believe we ought seriously to consider this question, so that perhaps we may come to some compromise in our conclusions that might be very satisfactory indeed to all of us.

I had chosen for special consideration the topic so ably discussed by Dr. McCormick, and I chose that because out in Iowa we have a special interest in it, and were anxious to know what the college presidents in the rest of this country are thinking about it. I think that one of the most important things we could discuss at this meeting is the topic of the advisability of state aid to the independent, denominational, or non-state institution. It has been tried in a number of states, and I am not sure I am well informed as to what the general experience has been. I know that there has been a great deal of consideration given to the question recently in the state of Vermont, and I have been interested in the discussions of conditions existing there. They have three colleges in that state that have been receiving state aid for many years; and recently, upon the conclusion of an educational survey by one of the great standardizing agencies of this country, the conclusion was reached that state aid; perhaps, should cease, or that the institutions should come under the control of the state. It is a mooted question. We hear it said that if the college receives state aid, the institution will not be free in its serv-

ice to its original constituency, and that a great many injuries will result to the institution and its ideals. I am not so sure of that, from what little I have heard of the matter under discussion.

I have been very much interested in Professor Royce's keen analysis of the conditions in Vermont, as given in his published letter to President Thomas of Middleboro College. It is said that there are two defensible positions. One is that the institution shall be owned and controlled by an independent board of trustees; that it shall rely entirely upon private philanthropy. That is said to be defensible and sound and that to accept any state aid is to "dry up" the sources of private philanthropy. The other position is that the institution shall be wholly owned and controlled by the state, and that it shall be supported by the state; that the state shall not aid any other institution that is not under its entire control, and which it does not own.

Now, taking Middleboro College as an example, in considering the validity of these two positions which is fair, if I understand the situation,—during the last few years the sources of private philanthropy have not been "dried up." I do not know whether that is due to the efforts of the splendid executive of that institution or not, but we do know that its resources have been increased by private philanthropy perhaps two-fold over what they were at the beginning of that period.

Is it not true that the state and the college—the state and the church, mother of the college, if you please—have always cooperated in this matter of educating the youth of the state? Is not that true at the present time, to a certain extent, in nearly every state in this Union, because of the legislative action of the state itself? In our own state of Iowa the legislature determines what standards we shall maintain; if the graduates of our institutions shall teach in the public schools—that is, if they shall be given certificates without examination in order to teach in the public schools. That is a form of state control, and I believe it is a legitimate form of state control. We are suffering out in Iowa

because, as was stated a while ago, three men can get together and organize a college, and grant degrees. Unhappily, we have an institution out there that does that sort of thing, without any Faculty that we know about, and without anybody being educationally responsible for the degrees which are issued. This matter has been considered by the commissioner of education, by our state superintendent, and still we do not know how we are going to get rid of it. We should like to have the state come to our aid; we should like to have the state tell us how we can get rid of an institution of that kind. We are very desirous of some state aid of that sort.

There is another thing that the state of Iowa needs at the present time, and that is more training schools for teachers in the grades. The college presidents of the state, in conference a few weeks ago, concluded that the colleges could do this type of work for the state, just as acceptably as it would be done in several new normal schools which the state might establish, and which would ultimately become colleges; and if we should do that it would be perfectly proper for the state to give some aid. This is the form of state aid really under discussion, I take it.

I know it is said that that will have a dwarfing effect on our colleges, that we are likely to lose all our ideals, if we accept a dollar of state money; but I am not so sure of that. I believe, however, that it is a matter that requires our most serious consideration. Suppose we were to establish in each of these institutions an educational department, to do a specific work for the state. Why should not the state give two thousand dollars, say, toward the support of that department, and Why should not the state supervise it? How is that going to effect our religious ideals? I believe that any institution that has been established because of certain religious ideals is not going to lose them when it receives money of this kind in this way. Of course, I may be all wrong, but that is my present belief in regard to it.

Now, there are just a few quotations that I want to

give from Professor Royce's letter to which I previously alluded. In the first place, however, I should like to say that I believe that every educational institution has a responsibility to the state in the education of its youth, and that it has the right to the support of the state in some form. I believe that the state and the denomination, if you please, should cooperate in the education of the youth for in doing so, a better result will be obtained than will otherwise be reached. I believe that private philanthropy should be received by the state institution in doing its work just as well as state aid may be received by the non-state college in doing its work.

Professor Royce, in discussing this question, and speaking now of the University of California, his own Alma Mater, says: "Such a university could never have been made by simply holding to the clear-out policy of state ownership and control. In various ways the state has effectively restrained its own ownership. This has aroused inevitably independent support, and as it has done this, it has stimulated, and not tied up private philanthropy." Again, in discussing the situation with reference to the non-state college, he says: "The right way to keep alive the state's interests is not always simply to abandon it to the mercy of those who are, perhaps, not sufficiently awake as yet to its needs, or sufficiently wealthy to meet them." And again: "The wisest way for the state to help very probably will not be to send some board of state officials to repeat the various stages of state miscontrol through which many Western institutions have passed. The wisest way for the state to live up to its own ideals is to make a wise use of the academic resources that it already has, with a broadly devised aid, based on the traditions and ideals of the state's existing institutions. I insist that, whatever the letter of the law may be, no state university of the West attains its highest development until it gets a certain measure of freedom from mechanical legislative control, and is effectively owned, not merely by the state, but by some reasonable organic union of state guidance and private

philanthropy. Such a union is possible." In that way he reasons that Middleboro College should continue to receive state aid from Vermont, as it has received it in the past, in doing a special type of work, which will be specially supervised by the state, in the interests of the citizenship which all types of colleges are interested in developing. I thank you.

President Slocum;

Mr. President, Gentlemen, and members of the Association of American Colleges: I am glad we have that name; "Association of American Colleges." May I, at the opening of what I want to say, indicate two or three things I strongly believe in regard to the American college? I agree with the statement made at one of the meetings of the Carnegie Foundation, that the most permanent factor in the whole American system of education is the college. As we are gathered here this morning we ought to repeat our creed, saying together: "I believe in the American College." I should like to go further. Personally I have no patience whatever with any modification of the four year course. Our business is to teach young men and women that they must take a place of ethical and intellectual leadership in the life of our country, and at the same time learn to love learning for its own sake. In the second place, the college preeminently must recognize that the fundamental purpose of education is the creation of character and two years is not sufficient to realize this end when one takes into consideration the nature of the calls that are coming to our young people.

The question I am to discuss is as to whether the independent college should seek for aid from the state. We need at the very outset to differentiate carefully, and recognize the real dominating function of the college. May I be allowed just one personal word? A good many years ago I was tendered the presidency of one of our state universities in the Middle West. I declined it for two reasons. First, I felt I did not have the special training necessary for directing such a large undertaking; and in the second

place, I wanted to give my life to the work of the college, because it seemed to me to offer an opportunity that is not afforded in any other institution.

One of the essential factors in the history of the college is its independence. It is true that the college seeks exemption from taxation; but this is asked simply that it may not be interfered with in the great work to which it is called; but whenever it seeks the support of the state for its current expenses it will seriously modify this independence. It will then lose its power to do its best work, and will just so far unite its capacity for training the young people of America for religious and ethical leadership.

The state universities have their well defined position and mission, and we are not reflecting upon them when we demand our own independence and aid. Without four years we cannot fulfill our mission. The state university has certain advantages, because it is supported by public funds. Because of this it comes into close relationship with the political life of the state. Personally, however, I would rather be connected with the independent colleges than with a state university under the domination of the state. The reason why I do not want help from public treasury is because I value independence. Harvard, Yale, Amherst, Williams, Oberlin, Swarthmore and Haverford have made their special contribution to the nation and to the world because they have not been under political control. They have stood on their own feet with the feeling that there is something one cannot buy with money.

It is a source of satisfaction that the college does its work and asks no favor from the state, except that it shall be untrammelled.

We gain aid from our giving constituencies because we are independent; not simply money but sympathetic goodwill as well as gifts. When we turn to the state for support, we shall lose that peculiar relationship with these intelligent, large-minded men and women which is so essential for the best life of the independent college. If we ask even for partial support from the state we shall put

into the minds of a great many people, who have great pressure upon them for gifts in other directions, the idea that the colleges do not need their money because they can secure aid elsewhere.

There is one thing that is more far reaching than all the rest together. I said at the beginning that the mission of the college is to train young people for leadership. This is the outgrowth of personal devotion to a moral principle; and, above all, to religion. I am not speaking from the standpoint of denominationalism or any technical definition of religion. The hope of America lies in religion. This is what our leaders must understand. The great function of the college is to train young people so they will know God. For this reason if for no other we must have them during the freshman, sophomore, junior and senior years. Personally I have no patience with so-called "junior colleges," if that means only two years of the life of those young people under our jurisdiction and influence.

The mission of our college is to train noble-minded, reverent and earnest young people, who will stand amid all the dangers of our American life, or be sent into the missionary movements of the world, or go in politics and in professional life, to Congress and the houses of Legislature, and stand for those things that are essential for saving our country, and leading it into its higher and larger destiny. If we are to do this it will not be because primarily we are making our students scientists, philosophers or acquainted with literature. This is necessary to secure the best mental discipline, but our final duty is to see that they are ready to do their work in the fear of God; to stand as something more than a doctor, a lawyer, a clergyman or a mere teacher. They should go out from our colleges as the sons of God ready to do His work, and do it well. If this is true, we are here because we believe that the college has an essential mission. Let us recognize with all our hearts that we have the best opportunity that has ever come to any educational foundation. Let us strike hands as we say to each other: "America needs the graduate of the college with

four years of hard, conscientious work, in order to be fitted to assume the responsibilities of Christian leadership in the life of the world."

We will need more money to do our work, but we must not sacrifice that independence which is essential for the fulfillment of our mission. We must magnify the organization and function of the college as we say to ourselves, "We will not be crushed between the high school and the university." If that ever comes, it will be the saddest day for the moral and religious life of our country that has ever dawned.

Dr. Pritchett was right when he said, "The most permanent factor in our educational system is the American college." It has not, so far as its fundamental purpose is concerned, changed very much in all the years of its existence on American soil. We have adjusted it to a great many conditions. We have adopted the elective system, modified its courses of study and broadened them vastly, but the college must be true to this historical purpose.

I trust that this group of men, representing the east, west, north and south, will stand together faithfully for the conservation of four years of training, because we want to make men ready for their work, recognizing that the end of all education is the production of character. It is the primary, predominant thing; it is the hope of our nation. The American college is called to create moral and religious leaders, and this cannot be done without adequate time. Most of all, the idea that should appeal to us more than anything else, is to create a religious leadership that shall dominate the life of America. That is why I want to be independent. That is why I believe we cannot afford to ask any state for direct help for the carrying on of our work, except to request that they let us alone, and do not put burdens upon us by taxation. We want to be free to do our best. You remember the word that came to the messenger of God, when he was called to a hard task as he waited before his King, who was none other than the King of all kings: "Stand on thy feet and I will speak unto

thee." With self-respect, humbly trying to fulfill our mission, let us do our work, believing that we are called of God.

THE BEST MANNER IN WHICH THE EXECUTIVE OF A COLLEGE CAN EMPLOY TIME AND PUT FORTH EFFORT.

I. WORK ON THE CAMPUS

ABRAM W. HARRIS, PRESIDENT OF NORTHWESTERN
UNIVERSITY.

At the beginning, a few words to define the topic assigned me. By "executive," I understand either president or dean, or both; and by "work on the campus," internal affairs, as opposed to others. I will attempt then, very briefly, to mention some, but not all, of the things which as it seems to me a president or dean ought to do in relation to the internal administration of a college. That will necessarily exclude all reference to the trustees and patrons, at least I purpose saying nothing about them, and will exclude public activities connected with the college, whether directly or only incidentally; and even with these exclusions it is clear that time will compel me to omit many matters, some of which are important. Nothing is of quite so much account as matters of the spirit, and yet I purpose saying nothing about them, because they may be taken for granted in this Association. I do not find it easy in such an address to make a clear distinction between such an institution as is here represented and others—a state university, for instance—for in the things I am to talk about, ideals must be very much the same in all colleges. I think the ideal I held in the days when I was president of a state university differed little, if at all, from those I hold now.

The executive ought to cultivate freshness of mind. A man who does not have intellectual alertness must fail to be properly effective upon his campus. How is this to be maintained? I suppose all of us have our own methods. I make it a rule—which I am free to say I do not always

keep—to read every day some poetry. It is important to practice himself, the advice he is likely to give his faculty, and read some professional literature and attend professional meetings. He must see that he is physically in good condition. It would be easy to add a whole list of “don’ts,” but I refrain, for they would reveal too many of my own faults, and that would not be comfortable for me nor interesting to this assembly.

The executive must have openness of mind. It is a great danger of educational men that they will too early in life come to conclusions that they will ever after persistently hold and strenuously defend against all comers; and education which deals with human beings and changing conditions must itself be constantly changing. Of recent years, a number of professional schools—medical schools and law schools—have come to require for admission two years of college work; and there is a strong tendency for the number to increase. When that requirement becomes general, we shall find in our colleges a great number of students who enter with no intention of staying more than two years. Some of them will stay to graduate, but others who expected to stay four years will at the end of the second year go on to the professional school. We may expect then that in ten or twenty years, perhaps a third of the freshmen and sophomores will be present for only two years’ work, definitely preparatory for the professional school. It is puerile to say we do not want such. We already have them and will have more. It is fortunate if a college has an openminded executive, who will study such a condition and not simply rail against it.

Again, we have all the problems that relate to co-education, to the effect of co-education upon the social life of the college and to the broader problems of woman’s education. It is of little use to abuse the conditions. But it is manifestly important to find out how to improve conditions, or cure them, or use them. There is no more interesting problem before such colleges as ours, in the next two or three generations than the one that may be put in

the question: How shall we best educate women? We are at the end of a period of struggle to demonstrate the fitness of women for the higher education. I can remember the time when many wise men in education, privately if not publicly, were of the opinion that women ought not to have a college education, that very few of them were fitted for it physically, if indeed mentally. If anybody holds such an opinion in these days, I have not met him. The question then arises: Shall we continue the present practice of giving women a kind of second-hand education planned for boys, or shall we courageously study the needs of women in education and try to satisfy them?

Turning to the college as a business enterprise, the executive ought to make a careful study of its finances. He ought to study economy continually; but of course I do not mean niggardliness. Education means so much, that none of the money a college has may be wasted. It is trite to say that colleges are poor. If I could take a vote here to find which of the colleges need more money, I'm sure the majority would exceed two-thirds. And yet, it sometimes seems that institutions most clamorous for more give very little study to making a dollar go farthest and do its best work. I was much pleased a few years ago, when a man, called to take charge of one of the Northwestern schools, said after examining our conditions, that one of his strongest reasons for accepting the place offered him was his conclusion that we were doing as much with our money as any institution he knew of. It is worth while for an institution to feel proud that it not only has a dollar to spend, but gets a dollar's worth in return; for there is a real danger that as colleges grow richer, they will not improve in proportion but only get results at greater cost. One of the most important duties of the executive is to prepare a careful budget every year.

The executive ought to look after the physical property; after sanitation, and ventilation, and problems of a like nature.

Is it worth while to say anything of discipline? Dis-

cipline, in the oldfashioned sense, used to be a very important topic. My first appointment as a college instructor came in the days when it was definitely specified that a "tutor" in a New England college should have charge of the discipline in the dormitories. In carrying out my duty, I made it a practice to put my overcoat, my hat and my rubber boots on a chair at the side of my bed every night when I went to sleep. But that is past; and there is very little "discipline" now to vex the spirit of the president. Yet there are other kinds of discipline that are certainly just as important as the "water cure" discipline. In the Middle West we have been doing a great work along the line of discipline in connection with athletics; and, on the other hand, the interest in athletics has been relieving us of many heavy burdens. The great discipline of honor and manliness, of the moral and religious welfare of an institution remain. And every college president will count these burdens a heavy load, but a glorious opportunity. I know of an institution where, I am told—and I think told truly there is no toleration on the part of the teachers or students for a lie. To put such a spirit into an institution, even at the cost of the greater part of a man's life, is more than worth while.

A president ought to be a very human man; he ought to have a sense of humor. Many an institution has suffered because the president, although a very good man, could not tell a joke from a sin. A man who does not have a good well-rounded, robust, well developed sense of humor is not fitted to be an administrative officer in a college dealing with young people. The president ought to be essentially sympathetic. I have sometimes said that no man ought to be responsible for the education of young men and young women until he has had children of his own. I remember a student on trial for an irritating offense, who was likely to receive a punishment out of proportion to the offense. As a last resort it was suggested that the members who had not done something as bad when students should vote for the proposed punishment, but the rest of

us who had not been caught, go a little easy with the culprit, for conscience sake. We found an easier way of dealing with the boy and in due time he came to be one of the brightest students in the institution; and is now an honored trustee of the college from which he came very near parting too soon.

Now, as to students. Most of us have at some time in our career, thought it our chief duty to get them. And so it doubtless is. We must prepare catalogues and circulars, and write letters, and make speeches, and—and—and—let us hope we are always fair and moderate and unselfish.

And the president must see to it that when the student has come to the campus, he shall find good educational conditions. The demands must not be unreasonable, nor slack. When admission standards have been set, college demands must be made to agree with them; and neither must the work be fitted to only the weaker men. The executive should be the student's adviser. And so he ought to know them; he ought to get into touch with the student life, the fraternity and sorority problems, and others like them. Perhaps there is nothing that promises greater returns than the handling of the freshman classes. It gets on my conscience that there is such an enormous mortality of freshmen. Some of it is inevitable; and when it is sure that a boy ought not to go on, then nothing better can happen to him than to go out quickly and get at something else. But, on the other hand, it may be a lifelong misfortune if a young fellow who has come into college prepared to do satisfactory work, makes a failure, for that sense of defeat may go with him through life. I am well persuaded that a good proportion of those who fail in the freshman year could be saved if we used the best methods in taking care of them. We ordinarily put our least experienced teachers at work with the freshmen; we leave to them the problem of inaugurating the college course without sufficient supervision. Colleges have a great responsibility to save students at the beginning of their course;

and if we will give serious attention to the study of this problem, we can save a great many who will do *alma mater* credit.

As to scholarship, the executive ought to be a careful student of all the conditions of his own institution. He ought to know the courses of study offered; he ought to keep in touch with changing conditions; he ought to study carefully his statistics. In the statistics of our colleges, there is so great a mine of information, that I have wondered that no college has ever appointed an "educational auditor" to see them. Years ago when I had charge of a secondary school, preparing boys for college, and found that our boys were not satisfactorily passing their college entrance examinations, I went to work to find out why. We were getting out reports of class work only twice a year, and the standings, when they did come out were so late that they were of no use to the office as an indication of what the teachers thought of their pupils, and of no use to the boys as an incentive. Then, the ranks, given by letters, were too vague. When they were tabulated—and I was obliged to change to a numerical system, to facilitate my study—I found one department averaging for all its marks almost 90, while another department averaged 68. I then posted once a month on the faculty bulletin board, the average of each instructor's marks, and in two months the faculty were marking on the same scale. Next, I called for frequent returns, which were given to the boys and their parents. In a year, the boys were passing their examination. Though this was not the whole explanation, it was an important one.

The executive must do what he can to bring new teachers into close sympathy with the institution. They have come from some other college where perfection is. They are newly come into a place of dignity, and must be dealt with gently. They are likely to demand the unreasonable of their classes. The sympathetic president or dean, may greatly help the freshman teacher and his pupils.

No function of the executive is so important as the selection of teachers. The faculty make the college, and men once chosen are likely to stay. A President who is a poor judge of men, or a careless one, may work harm that will last long after he is gone. There are some men who have a rare art of selecting men, and happy the college that has such a one for its head.

Lastly, the college executive ought to realize, not only formally but very sincerely, his own proper relation to the institution, the trustees and the faculty. Occasionally, I hear a president speak of "my faculty." It is a dangerous phrase; for it may mean that he takes the attitude of the employer, or the manager. If so, he is perilously near the rocks. A college ought not to be thought of as made up of an employer and employees. It is rather a great brotherhood, in which the president is only the servant of the many. In that brotherhood, he ought to include not only the teachers, not only all of the alumni, but the students also. It is easy to lose that attitude; it is trying at times to accept a faculty conclusion when sure that another is better. But if we are to be democratic, we must accept the faults of democracy and set them over against the advantages.

He is a good college president or dean who is himself loyal to the principles he lays down, who is cheerful under defeat, modest in success, increasing in labors, abounding in sympathy, and true always to the spirit he serves.

THE BEST MANNER IN WHICH THE EXECUTIVE OF A COLLEGE CAN EMPLOY TIME AND PUT FORTH EFFORT.

II. IN FIELD WORK

LOUIS EDWARD HOLDEN, PRESIDENT OF THE COLLEGE OF
WOOSTER.

There are so many ways for the executive of a Christian college to spend his time profitably in field work for his institution that it would be presumption on my part to specify the *best way*, either from the standpoint of the col-

lege or its president. What is the *best* way must be decided by the individual man or his institution.

I well remember a criticism, of a large benefactor of Christian colleges, of a certain college president for whom he had great affection. It ran about like this, "The difficulty with him is that he is a most attractive public speaker and he loves to appear in public. The result is that he is invited to speak at every cross-roads teachers' convention, church, and high school commencement. His mind is occupied with the preparation for these occasions and the compliments of those who hear him, while his college is languishing and dying for the lack of his personal attention."

The man of whom he spoke was faithfully carrying out his idea as to the *best* use of his time in *field work* for his institution. It was evident that his critic believed that he could spend his time more profitably in cultivating the acquaintance of such men as himself and presenting the claims of Christian education to those who were denominationally affiliated with his institution. Who is wise enough to say which one of these men was right? With all respect for the critic, I am frank to say that it was not every college president who followed his method that succeeded with him. Sometimes it was a question whether an interview with him did not take more nervous strength from the president who attempted it than the college was warranted, all things considered, in permitting.

There are college presidents who have, before their election to their high office, frankly told the Board of trustees that they would not accept the office if they were to be held responsible for the financial growth of the institution. They had thus far given their lives to scholarship pursuits. They had fitted themselves to become authorities in their specialties. They would teach, preach, lecture, write books for general distribution, if the Board so chose, but they would not raise money to maintain or advance Christian education.

Manifestly, these presidents have had their own ideas

as to the best manner in which the executive of a college could employ his time and effort in field work. If these men are conscientiously able to carry out their ideals and still hold the position of the presidency of their respective institutions, I congratulate them. They are certainly fortunate in having been called to well established institutions having an exceedingly efficient Board of Trustees to assist them. Most of us have been called to do pioneer work and we have had to lay aside our theories and scholarly ideals and devote ourselves to the plain everyday needs of our institutions. I venture to say that if we had time to listen to the story of every president here, you would find that less than ten percent of our number have been able to carry out the program laid down for themselves at their own inauguration. Some, like myself, have been tried by fire; others by consolidation of their institution with another; while still others have seen the removal of an entire plant to another site. Under such circumstances the president had to be the man of the hour and forsake his personal ambitions, or perhaps lose his life only to find it.

I will not attempt, therefore, to confine myself strictly to the subject, viz. "The *Best Manner in Which the Executive of a College Can Employ Time and Put Forth Effort in Field Work*," but will, if I may, suggest, out of my own experience, some methods that I have used, more or less successfully, in keeping the college before its constituents or denomination to which it belongs.

When we consider that the main reason for the existence of the Christian or denominational college is that it believes that the formative element in history is Christianity and according to its philosophy there is a personal God, a divine Christ, an immortal soul, and an imperative duty, we realize that only those who believe in such a philosophy and possess a vital faith are likely to foster and maintain the Christian college. Such persons are to be found in the church and it is the business of the church to multiply their number as rapidly as possible. Our first thought, therefore, should be how to maintain and to strengthen the

link which binds the church to the college and the college to the church. It is no news to any of you that this relation between the college and the church is a very difficult one to maintain, largely on account of the great number of people who are to be kept in touch with the work of the college and to be informed as to its mission. While the formal relation between the college and the denomination makes it easy to arouse the interest and enlist the support of its constituency, which might otherwise be lost to the cause of education, nevertheless, it is by no means an economical method of securing support for higher education. The president of a state university presents his budget to the state legislature and pleads his cause before it as a jury with a generous and unlimited treasury behind it. The president of a Christian or denominational college finds his constituents of perhaps 100,000 communicants distributed in little companies of from one hundred to two hundred people throughout a great state, perhaps 350 by 400 miles in area. His work is to inform each one of this one hundred thousand people of the past, present and future history of his institution. He must neglect none of them, for if he does he is hindering the work of his successor. It is manifestly impossible for him to reach from five to six hundred churches each year, although it is not so difficult to keep in touch with the pastors of these churches, even though there are frequent changes among the pastors. It is evident that we must resort to printers' ink. The first thing to do, however, is to get a directory of the communicants of each church in your territory and denomination. This is not a difficult task. I have a card catalogue of the membership of the entire Presbyterian church in the state of Ohio and whenever I wish to send a printed document to every member of the Presbyterian church in Ohio I can readily do so. There are two classes of literature sent out from our office: the first to prospective students, the second to prospective givers. That you may have some idea of the character of these leaflets, I will give the titles of some of them.

First, those that have to do with prospective students:

College Training Develops Power.
 Why Go to College?
 The Value of College Training as Experienced by
 Representative Men.
 Education from the Christian's Point of View
 Essential.
 A Survey of Religious Activities of the Students.
 After Twenty Years.
 Science at Wooster.
 From Farm to College.
 Some Advantages of the Small College.
 An Educational Opportunity.
 Do You Believe in Preparation for Life's Work?
 Why Should You Go to College?
 What College to Choose for a Son or Daughter.
 An Ideal Place for Self-Discovery.

Second, those that go to prospective givers:

Why Should the Christian College Live?
 The Presbyterian Church in Higher Education.
 The Urgent Claim of Christian Colleges.
 What Would You Have Wooster Do, Work or
 Wait?
 The Place and Function of the Christian College.
 Christian Education.
 The Christian College.
 Views of Presbyterian College Presidents in Re-
 sponse to Inquiries by the College Board as to
 the Importance of a Retiring Fund for College
 Professors.
 Certain Questions Answered Concerning Retiring
 Allowances for the Advancement of Teaching.
 The Needs of the College of Wooster.
 The Real Need of the Retiring Allowance Fund
 for the Advancement of Teaching.

Do the Returns from the College of Wooster Warrant its Maintenance by the Presbyterian Church?

Have You Made Your Will?

We find that the greatest difficulty of our work is the ignorance of the pastors and the church concerning it. Therefore we are attempting to make the church intelligent in respect to our problems. For example, the total expenditures of the Synod of Ohio for all purposes reaches \$2,000,000 annually, \$9,000,000 of this amount has been the gift towards Christian Higher Education.

The next step is to secure financial co-operation on the part of the church with the college. This is the most difficult task, for various reasons. First, most of our colleges were founded one or more generations ago and those who are pastors of our churches today lack the enthusiasm of the early founders of the college. Secondly, in the rotation of pastors we frequently find men who are from colleges that are not supported by the church and they are more or less indifferent in respect to the claims of the Christian college upon the church. Thirdly, there are those who do not believe that the church should be asked to support education in this country where the state provides so generously for those who desire higher education.

Frequently, it is a matter of many years before a college, even though it is a denominational college, is able to secure the united co-operation of the ecclesiastical body under which it is operating to the extent that it is willing to recommend and request that each church place the institution in its budget for a certain percent of its benevolent funds. It has taken forty-five years to accomplish this in Ohio, among the Presbyterians. Now that it is accomplished, we feel that it is the wisest and best single effort that we have ever made. Anyone might say, "Why was this not done at the very beginning?" The question is easier asked than answered. Theoretically, it was the thing to do; practically, it was impossible to accomplish at that time.

We believe that the recent movement among the alumni of many of our colleges looking toward the employment of an alumnus as corresponding secretary, who shall devote all of his time to keeping the alumni in sympathy with the growing life of their Alma Mater, is a wise effort in the right direction, and we trust that the movement may spread throughout all our Christian colleges. The president should welcome and encourage such a movement. It is hardly possible to expect that any denomination is likely to be able to supply all the needs of a large and growing educational institution. While it is a well known fact among us all that the alumni of a college cannot do very much in the support of the college until the institution has passed its first hundred years of service to the public, we are all well acquainted with the fact that after that date the alumni become the main support of their institution. They become its best endowment. A college never should lose sight of any student that has enjoyed its opportunities even for a limited time.

The president will find it much to the advantage of his institution to keep in touch with the College Board of his denomination. It is his privilege as well as duty to keep the Secretaries informed and familiar with the work of the institution he represents. He should be considerate, however, of the fact that the Board has from fifty to sixty just such institutions as his own to foster. He should do his best to relieve the Board from any anxiety concerning the institution over which he presides, that the Board might spend its efforts in behalf of those that have a less efficient leader. We should desire that the College Board should be the great advertising means for Christian education throughout the church, and not an educational pawnshop to loan money to feeble institutions on which they take mortgages, nor a Fortunatus purse into which a lazy but sharp Board of Trustees may plunge their hands to the elbows in order to meet the immediate needs of the institution over which they preside.

It is always wise for a president to visit other insti-

tutions of equal grade with his own that he may keep himself familiar with what is being done by these institutions for their students. It is quite likely that he will be surprised that his catalogue is overstating the advantages of attendance upon his own institution in preference to that of others. He should be informed on what is being done by other denominations for the education of their young people. He should be the educational expert or adviser for his denomination in his state. Frequent visitation to other institutions will quicken his enthusiasm to assist his own to be more efficient in its service to its constituency.

The field work with which the average president is most familiar is that of visitation among the most prosperous men and women of his denomination. This work must be done largely by the president himself. Financial agents or corresponding secretaries are frequently of very great assistance in the general field work, and if they are the right sort they increase rather than diminish the president's work. The personal equation is of great value in any business, and the business of education is no exception. Men who give largely are careful to select institutions that are presided over by men in whom they have confidence. Rarely do large givers see the institution they honor with their beneficence. Possibly they have met the president and his frank and able presentation of the cause of his institution has resulted in a gift. More frequently, however, they have reached their conclusions through the judgment and advice of experts in education. These experts arrive at their judgment through our college boards, catalogues and other literature sent out by the college, and through the alumni. Does your college board believe in the efficiency of your college? Does the catalogue tell the truth? Is the faculty padded? Can the men who are actually members of the faculty possibly do all that they are said to do? Are they thoroughly trained men for the tasks before them? What about the product of the institution; does the quality of the scholarship compare favorably with the best of other institutions? What has been

the character of their graduate work in graduate institutions? Do they rank with the best men from other colleges? The answers to these questions form the basis upon which the educational expert founds his judgment as to whether the returns from your institution warrant its maintenance by the man whose judgment is asked.

It is sometimes very disconcerting to a president to receive the unbiased judgment of an educational expert regarding his institution. There is no dust in his eyes nor cobwebs in his brain. He is devoid of all sentiment; he is not hampered by the historical setting of the institution; he judges your institution by what it is in comparison with other institutions doing a similar work, and his judgment is usually correct.

Never before in the history of our country has the Christian college, with real merit, had so many friends and been so popular as an educational institution as it is today. We should be most grateful to such philanthropists as John D. Rockefeller and Andrew Carnegie who, being in deepest sympathy with every effort that our respective denominations are making to standardize their educational work, have so generously established the Carnegie Foundation and General Education Board to assist in the work. Fortunately the men in charge of these great endowments for the purposes of education do not despise the day of small things in the life of any educational institution. We who represent the Christian colleges are just as graciously received at the offices of these great Boards as the presidents who represent the larger and more wealthy institutions of the East. We should be careful to assist them in presenting the facts connected with such institutions in a business-like and truthful way, omitting nothing. We cannot allow an opportunity to escape us of expressing our appreciation of the splendid service rendered the cause of education by these two boards.

In closing, let me express my judgment that any man that is fit for his office is not likely to go very far astray in his field work for his college. A man who thoroughly

believes in his institution has a story to tell that will interest everybody. As Christians we are in business for the King. His servants are interested in all that interests Him. He is interested in having Christian men fill the places of leadership, influence, and moral power in the world. Such leaven will leaven the whole lump sooner or later. This is the fundamental reason why the church has founded the Christian college and has sacrificed to maintain it.

SHALL THE EXECUTIVE TEACH.

JOHN WILLIS BAER, PRESIDENT OF OCCIDENTAL COLLEGE.

Mr. President and Gentlemen: After hearing these two gentlemen who have preceded me, tell of the thousand and one important things we are expected to do, do you still ask, "Shall the President teach?"

Nevertheless, I still believe that the president of a college should teach some. In order that you may get my viewpoint, and experience as a college president let me say that I come from a small college numerically, with great ideals and high scholastic standards. I have been there but eight years. During that time the trustees have reorganized the governing board; but three of the old Faculty of twenty-two remain. There is a new curriculum. Instead of giving a B. L. degree in three years, as they sometimes did ten years ago, they are now giving a B. L. and B. A. for four years of college work. There is a new charter. The institution was formerly ecclesiastically connected with the local Presbytery. It now is not, but in changing it has not sacrificed the friendship, the loyalty, and the cooperation of the Presbyterian Church, throughout the Presbytery, the synod or in the nation. It has increased its entrance requirements until, this last September not a freshman was accepted who did not bring a certificate of graduation from an accredited high school in California or

some other state, with at least 15 recommended credits. If his credits were not of recommended grades he was received on probation, for at least one semester. A less number than fifteen was not received at all. The college has done away with its academy; it has no graduate work, and does not expect to have. It had a beautiful campus of 23 acres, with five buildings, in the residential section of Los Angeles, and only last September moved upon a new country campus of 90 acres, with new buildings, without a dollar of indebtedness of any kind lodged against the new enterprise. In that time the trustees have increased the productive endowment to \$310,000. There still remains to their credit the value of the old campus, which has not yet been sold, and which will more than pay the accumulated indebtedness of the last twenty-five years on the old institution. Nevertheless, though the president of that college has had a busy life during all these changes he comes with fear and trembling before you gentlemen, representing as you do large and small institutions, and says that, he believes the president of a college should teach,—some.

Once upon a time Theodore Roosevelt was President of the United States. During that time he appointed his then very sincere and close friend, William Howard Taft, Governor of the Philippines. As William Howard Taft was sailing from the Golden Gate to take up his work, he received a letter from President Roosevelt. The last clause of that letter is the text of my talk. "The one thing supremely worth having is the opportunity, coupled with the capacity, to do a thing worthily and well, the doing of which in its vital importance touches all human kind." Gentlemen, in the language of the man author, that is a "bully" sentence! More than that, I choose to consider it a clarion call to service and though I am comparatively a young man in this service, I dare ask you too to heed it. Let me turn it like a sweet morsel on my tongue once more, for it is better than anything of my own that I am going to say. "The one thing supremely worth having is the opportunity, coupled with the capacity, to do a thing worth-

ily and well, the doing of which in its vital importance touches all human kind." I never saw in so few potential words my conception of the opportunity of a college president. Now for an application or two of Mr. Roosevelt's sentence.

The subject must be separated in two parts. Of course, the college is an institution, and it is more than that, it is an influence. First, it is an institution, and if I am right in saying that the president must teach, or should adjust his program so that he can have time to teach, then we have got to revise our methods somewhat. I have come to believe that not many of us—though some of us have sometimes said so—are really overworked. We are not overworked but we are over-occupied. There is a big difference. I must be honest with you because I see one or two of my associates smiling. True; I am away on a leave of absence; seeking rest because of a "hot box" I was sent to Canada to cool off in the snow. But gentlemen the fault was my own. I should have done earlier what I am determined to do when I go back, and that is, to take fewer things into my own hands, and do those things better than I do hold to. We need to learn the gentle art of delegation. We can delegate to others some of these administrative duties of which my friends have been speaking and which we do so love to handle ourselves. I mean too that our trustees should be magnified and bear the financial burdens more than they have.

I have never taught regularly in class room and will add this, in order to "save my face" a little bit, on my plea for teaching. I have been selfish enough, gentlemen,—and I speak with a good deal of emotion, because it was sheer selfishness,—to take my college chapel every single day, unless I invite some visitor to take my place, and then it has frequently been with a great deal of reluctance I have allowed him to have the privilege of facing the student body. The reason I am so selfish is that I did not have the personal touch with the students that my associates of the Faculty had in the class rooms. Coming over

from Boston within a day or two on the train, I read this book, "A Life of Mark Hopkins," by Carter. I have found inspiration in its pages. We have heard so much about Mark Hopkins that we think we know all about his influence but Mr. Chairman, let me remind you that he not only conducted chapel, almost exclusively, and preached on Sunday, but the largest commendation that is given to Mark Hopkins, as the president of Williams College is in the chapter or two on Mark Hopkins as a teacher in the class room. After careful thought I have come to believe, that we have not begun to appreciate our opportunities along that line. Therefore, I say to you that, even though the president is expected to administer the college as an institution, I, for one, think that some of us must revise our methods, enough to find time for some teaching. I do not know exactly how you are going to do it, but I know perfectly well how I can do it. I must re-arrange my program. Several times during the past few years the Dean of the college has said to me. "Mr. Baer, won't you for at least one semester take one class?" And heretofore I have given him conscientiously the reply that many of you have made, "I am too busy." I never have forgotten, when leaving my former position in New York to go out to the Pacific Coast, of saying farewell to a company of men, one of whom facetiously said, "Oh, we will not say good bye to Mr. Baer. True, he is going out into California, but he will be living right here in New York most of the time. He is a college president now." I turned with a good deal of feeling and said, "My dear sir, I have not joined that company of gentlemen, who see little of their student body, and whose fears are more familiar in Wall street than on their own campus and in the class room;" and yet so far I have not been able, outside of daily chapel, to come into a class room touch with my own students.

My second point is that the college is more than an institution, it is an influence. I have suggested that as the college is an institution, we presidents revise our methods.

I now say of the college that it is an influence and we should revive our motives. My interest in education is absolutely on the positive Christian side.

When Bishop McDowell and President King, were speaking along that line last night their stirring words put backbone into at least one college president, and I said to myself, "I want to have a part with them in getting into close touch with the young men and women who come to college."

I will tell you frankly, gentlemen, I do not know whether you think this is at all a contribution to the solving of your problems, but I want to say that I would a great deal rather something like this which I am about to read to you from Mark Hopkins life might be written of me, than to accomplish anything in the matter of buildings, endowments or anything else material. Listen to this, "In 1883 the Class of 1863, of which 22 members were present, adopted this resolution: 'On this, the 20th anniversary of our graduation, the undersigned members of the Class of 1863 extend to the venerable and beloved President Hopkins our warmest greetings. Having tested the value of his instructions during a score of years in various spheres of thought and action, and having found them under all circumstances helpful for guidance and inspiration of immense worth in the working out of our careers and the molding of character and life, we come back and lay at his feet the tribute of our gratitude and affection.'" I wish also to read a letter written to Mark Hopkins by that successful clergyman, Washington Gladden. "My dear Sir: I have asked my publisher to send you a volume of sermons, which I beg you to accept with my grateful remembrance. It would be quite unfair to hold you responsible for the doctrines taught, though I strongly hope that you will find in them far more to approve than to condemn. But if there is anything of skill or success in the methods of presenting the truth, or anything of philosophical breadth and candor in the manner of dealing with it, then these qualities, sir, are largely due, I am sure, to impressions made on

my mind when in your classes twenty-five years ago I sat at your feet."

Gentlemen, there has not been much of the practical in what I have said. It is positive testimony, however, and based on only a little bit of experience comparatively. But I wish to re-enforce it with this: Before I went into college work, per se, I was privileged to go from institution to institution, university, college and preparatory school, in connection with my work in the Eastern states, and was invited as chapel speaker or preacher. The thing that disturbed me was this, that frequently the platform where the Faculty should have been was innocent of their attendance; and secondly how the simplest word of music when touching the positive religious note had the closest attention of the students. They let a visitor have the monopoly of saying a good stiff word for God. So I say to you, that I have come to believe, through those visits for ten years to the universities of the East and Central West, and in other lands, too, and through my experience as president of Occidental college, that there are three watch words, at least, for the college president. They are: culture, citizenship and Christianity; and the greatest of these is Christianity. So let us get close and dignify our calling by becoming teachers of the right kind. Revise the methods and revive the motives.

Now, then, see if I have not made good; as far as my borrowed Roosevelt text is concerned, here it is: "The one thing supremely worth having is the opportunity, coupled with the capacity, to do a thing worthily and well, the doing of which in its vital importance touches all human kind." Men, if we are not doing that let us go back home and resolve to get close to our students, in some way or other, in the readjustment of our programs, in with the hope of finding a little time at least for our class rooms.

DISCUSSION.

DONALD J. COWLING, PRESIDENT OF CARLETON COLLEGE.
C. N. STEFFENS, PRESIDENT OF DUBUQUE GERMAN COLLEGE.

President Cowling;

Mr. President and Gentlemen: When I was asked to lead in the discussion this afternoon, I supposed that I was expected merely to occupy five or six minutes in following up the points made by the other speakers; but after listening to the splendid address which President Slocum slipped in this morning under the head of discussion, I feel somewhat poorly prepared for my part in the program. I am reminded of the situation in which a certain student of the English Bible found himself at examination time. He had been told that one of the questions invariably asked was to name the twelve apostles. At this particular examination, however, that question was omitted, and this one was put in its place: Name the prophets, and distinguish between the major and minor. He wrote his answer: "Far be it from me to distinguish between those godly men, but the names of the twelve apostles are as follows." He was simply using what material he had, and that is what I shall do.

The subject this afternoon suggests two variables. One is "the institution;" the second is "the man." How a college executive may best employ his time will depend very largely upon what is needed in the particular institution with which he is connected. It seems to me that there are two or three things worth considering in this connection. In the first place, I suppose we all agree that there is not a single college in America, with the possible exception of New England, that considers itself fully established and completely equipped with all it needs to do its work well. We are confronted with the double problem of building up institutions as such, and of doing the distinctly educational work that such institutions are designed to accomplish.

When a college executive looks squarely into the face of the facts connected with the actual present situation of

his college, he realizes that his problems are of a practical and not of a theoretical nature. I know of an institution which had a president who said that his administrative creed included two main articles: first, that it was not the business of a college president to raise money; and second, that it was his business to see that the institution was run within its income. I have no doubt but that every one of us would agree theoretically with the absolute soundness of these two principles. That president had a successful administration in many ways, but the college was in about the same condition when he left as when he began.

I wish with all my heart that it were not necessary for a college president to raise money. I am sure this is not expected of him in Eutopia. We have all been enchanted with the charming picture of Mark Hopkins which President Baer has put before us. It is a beautiful dream. I only wish it were possible for me. I know it is not. Six years ago, when I undertook the work I am now in, if I had any qualification whatever for the position, it was not on the score of money raising, but because of what little success I may have had in the class room, in personal touch with students. But after these six years, it is precisely at this point of direct personal contact with students that I feel most the limitations of my present position. The rich rewards that came to Mark Hopkins in the form of student affection and gratitude for what he had done for them personally, made possible by intimate acquaintance throughout the course, are rewards which the modern teacher should covet, but which the average college president can hardly hope to enjoy. His task is to make opportunities for others to do a larger work than could be accomplished without his aid, and this task in the last analysis involves money. Under present conditions, I can see no escape from this conclusion, at least so far as my own problem is concerned.

With regard to the second point, I want to insist that it is much more important that a college shall actually provide all that it promises, than that it be run in a given year

within its income. Any institution undertakes a serious responsibility when it invites students with the promise of providing a college education. It cannot righteously slip out from under that responsibility by saying that funds are lacking for doing the things promised.

So much then for the first of our two variables, namely the institution itself and the problems that cluster around it. The other variable is the man. We are not all built alike, and one college president may succeed by methods which are of no value whatever to another. I was much interested in President Harris' very excellent summary of the qualities necessary for a good president. My summary is not essentially different from his.

First of all, a man must have ideas. When I was a student at Yale, there was a story current to the effect that one of the college preachers in a very long prayer was imploring for more power, when the president ventured a whispered suggestion, "Brother, I think we have power enough. Pray for a few ideas." It is astonishing, when you come to think about it, how few new ideas have been introduced into higher education here in the Middle West, despite the magnificent opportunity we have had in building up from the ground brand new institutions. Too many of us have simply taken the catalogues of the older institutions and duplicated what we found, without any attempt whatever at original thinking on our own part. I recently heard of a southern colored college that had not only taken over a list of courses bodily from the catalogue of another institution, but in the instance of one department, had actually copied the name of the head of the department in the institution from which the catalogue came, and by a mistake in proof reading it got into their own catalogue. I am afraid that is only too characteristic of our whole situation.

I believe heartily in standardization, and I suppose I have about as much right as the average college president to claim recognition for his own institution on that score. Nevertheless, I have recently come to question in my own

mind the value of extreme emphasis on standardization. Why? I am not sure that we should all be cut over the same pattern. I think there is a very real danger that the way to better things in higher education may be blocked by setting up absolute and right standards to which everybody is expected to conform. I believe that the Middle West in particular is in a position to profit greatly by wise experimentation in educational work. Any emphasis upon standardization that has a tendency in its working out to cut off the opportunity for such experimentation, I regard as obstructive and reactionary. Of course, I am well aware of the fact that those who object to standards are very often those who are not able to meet fair requirements rather than those who believe in experimentation. I was very much pleased this afternoon at the welcome that was given to Clark College. There are a lot of other institutions that might apply for membership in this Association on the basis of less than 120 hours, and there would be no such unanimous approval. Why? Because the experiment that is carried on at Clark College is a genuine and righteous thing, while a similar situation in some other institution could not be described in any such terms. I believe we ought to see to it, in our concern for standards, that we do not cut off opportunity for legitimate and desirable experimentation.

The first qualification, then, of a resourceful college president is that he must experience a free and steady flow of fresh ideas in his mind. The second qualification is that he must believe in some of them. Some people have plenty of ideas but they never come to anything. We are not willing to take a venture in order that the ideas we believe in may be realized. Too many of us want to see the end from the beginning and we refuse to start anything unless it is sure to succeed from the outset.

Take the question of tuition for example. I am sure that a lot of us ought to be charging more than we do. Instead of clipping the professors' salaries, it would be much better in many cases to charge the students a little more,

but we are afraid to do it. We are afraid of losing students. The question of entrance conditions furnishes another illustration. I feel convinced that we should greatly increase the influence and enhance the prestige of our institutions if we insisted rigidly on proper preparation on the part of those who seek the opportunities we offer. But we are afraid. We have clear ideas of what a model college ought to be, but in actual practice we stop short of insisting upon the very ideas that are essential for the realization of our dreams. I believe that many of us would be more effective if we were willing to venture a little in behalf of the things we really believe in.

The third qualification necessary for a college president is capacity for hard work. I do not believe there is any class of men in the country to-day who work harder than college presidents; and by that I mean real work,—not simply being occupied. I am in sympathy with Dr. Baer's suggestion. It is possible to be occupied and feel busy and get nothing done. But I do not believe that most college presidents are open to criticism in that respect. Most that I know seem to me to be prodigious workers, and there is therefore, Mr. Chairman, no need for me to emphasize capacity for hard work as one of the essential qualities of a college president. I thank you.

President Steffens:

The Saturday before Christmas Sunday the Episcopalian rector asked me, a Presbyterian clergyman, to preach the Christmas sermon for them. He asked me to bring my gown, because he did not have any to spare; so I brought my Geneva gown with me, and attempted to preach a Presbyterian sermon in an Episcopal church. When I returned home Mrs. Steffens said to me, "You seemed to be a little blackbird among a great many whitebirds." I confess that I feel like a little blackbird here this afternoon, attempting to say something in opening the discussion that is to follow these admirable addresses that we have heard.

I was not trained to become a college president. I graduated from a small college, and I was forced to take the presidency of a little German theological school, where my father had not received his salary for six months. The only reason, I think, that I was called to that position, was because my mother said that in all probability her son might be able to raise \$50,000.

I want to emphasize the fact that it is a pity that most of us did not have the preparation we should have. I was conversing not long ago with a young man, a graduate of New York University, a student of Harvard, who had also spent two years at Oxford. A compelling ideal possessed him of becoming some time a dean in a college. If that young man continues his studies as he plans, and teaches a few years in a Western College, and then assumes the duties of deanship in one of the Eastern universities, I am sure that that man will be prepared for his great task. I do not know that I can add very much to the discussion this afternoon, but I would like to say two things. My father, who was a theological professor, used to tell me that I ought to cultivate the homiletic instinct; that a minister ought to see sermons in all the details of life; and that he ought always to keep his eyes and ears open in order that he might the more readily appropriate them. So I think that a college president who keeps his eyes and ears open all the time, wherever he may be, will learn many things that may help him to deal with human nature in his college, to lead his board of trustees, and enter sympathetically upon a program with his Faculty, and interest and enthuse his students in their work.

I would advise a college president who wants to have his college enlarge its influence, that he ought to cultivate particularly in his field work the instinct of publicity. He does not necessarily need always to have an advertisement in the paper, but he can advertise the work of his school wherever he goes.

I think that we can learn many things in the matter of publicity. Let your college be known everywhere. I want

to say to you that it was a hard thing to take before the public a small German theological school, without a curriculum, without any endowments, and with a great deal of debt. It was done, however, and now we have an enrollment of 250, representing thirty different nationalities, young men with clear intellects; and we are seeking to mold them into American citizenship, and teach them the highest American ideals. That college today is accredited, affiliated with the University of the State of Iowa; and this has been accomplished principally through the fact of letting the institution be known throughout the world. The students have come from every part of the world to receive their education and become leaders among men.

There is one other thing which I think perhaps has been forgotten in the discussion this afternoon, and that is this: The one supreme qualification of a college president, I believe, is the personal approach. We must cultivate a personal ability to lead to Jesus Christ. It seems to me that no agency that the institution can employ will be so effective in dealing with the wounds and heartaches of the humblest student of the president. I care not whether you are the president of a university or of a very small college, your duty to God and your duty to your students is best performed by personal contact, leading the young men to the feet of Jesus Christ. Whether you do it in the class room or in the office, in the students' rooms or on the athletic field, I believe the mission of the Christian president is definitely to lead men to a knowledge of God. Thank you.

THE PRESENT-DAY COLLEGE.

PRESIDENT J. H. T. MAIN, GRINNELL COLLEGE.

If I were to ask you who are members of this group to write out for me a definition of education, I fancy there would be as many divergencies in the definitions as there are people here. There would doubtless be some agreement

on fundamental principles, but even on fundamentals there would be a variety of opinion. These attempts at definition would suggest that there is no established definition of education.

If again I were to ask you to think carefully on your own definition and present to me, say within a month, a plan for the actual realization of your definition, I believe there would be still greater variety. I venture there would be plans for as many colleges distinctive in type as there are people here, assuming of course that they brought to bear on the problem a vigorous constructive imagination.

These two remarks hint at the characteristic in American education, a characteristic that belongs naturally to education in a democratic people. Education is, or comes to be, the expression of individual opinion supported usually, but not always, by traditions or local circumstances. The present-day American College, especially if recently founded, with traditions yet to form, if it is in a state university, is administered in such a way as to meet as far as possible the practical interests of the people. This is well. I do not question the need of such an institution, but in meeting this demand a definite educational standard, a universal requirement, however fundamental it is, may be and often is neglected, or ignored entirely. A state university is a state institution. It does not, and probably ought not, aim to be national. It is for a certain group of people first of all, and its first duty is to them. It must respond to their requirements and to their need, real or fancied. The state university is an attempt to realize the efficiency conception of education for the whole people of a state. It does not venture, except in a tentative and cautious way, to impose upon them a method or system of education which might meet a universal standard. If such a standard were available, the state would hold it in abeyance or reject it entirely. It would not necessarily be relevant, and at best would be regarded as incidental to the main purpose of the establishment.

If a benevolently inclined person gives outright, or bequeaths, a large sum to found an educational institution, a search begins when the time for action arrives, for a suitable man to organize and develop it. This man when he is found has for himself possibly a definition of education. He deliberates on this definition, and with such help as he cares for, proceeds with energy and caution to realize his definition in the construction of the organized institution. Such an institution will tend to be the expression of an individual. It may and very likely will involve universal elements. It will be the expression of a new definition, or a modified definition, of education, and will be given to the educational world with a distinct individuality. Illustrative of this point is Johns Hopkins University, which at the time was a new type of institution for America. The University in its early days realized a certain definition and ideal of education which was originally formulated in the mind of President Gilman. In the early 90's, the University of Chicago took form realizing a certain definition and ideal of President Harper. Just recently Reed College of Portland, Oregon, has been organized and is now only beginning its work, realizing a certain definition and ideal of President Foster. Many other instances of the same sort might be mentioned. A notable one is that of Rice Institute of Houston, Texas.

The point to be made is that there is no particular kind of education that we may call American, as for example we may call education in Germany, German education. The German gymnasium, whether it be on the eastern border of the empire or on the western, whether it be in a large city or in a small one represents a type. The gymnasium is a gymnasium regardless of its location. We know specifically what the gymnasium does. It is not the expression of an individual or a local view. It represents a standard of education, an ideal, a tradition long established. The same is true of the Real-gymnasium, the Real-Schule, and the trade schools of various kinds. Of course, the same is true of the universities. They conform

to a type. We know what the German university is, whether it be in Leipsig, Heidelberg or Berlin. There is no violent conflict of method. A student goes from one to another without a break in the continuity of his education.

In America, on the other hand, education, present-day education, conforms to no type but to individual, local tendencies and to traditions. We of America criticize the German system for not being democratic; but we of America often criticize our own system for not being efficient, distinctive and purposeful in a large sense. We criticize it for not reaching after the universal and fundamental. The German system is, the best system for Germany. It has grown out of the national life. It is an expression of national ideals. It represents the German desires and needs. A criticism from the American point of view is not valid. It indicates a lack of understanding, a lack of appreciation of what is involved in the German system. The German university does not aim to be democratic in our sense. It aims to be, and is, German.

The American method or methods looked at in the large, are possibly the best available or attainable at present for America. They are the expression of our democratic institutions. They are self-controlled, state-controlled, or denominationally controlled; and oftentimes they are more narrowly individualistic than these terms would indicate. they are representative of the way our institutions, social and political, have grown up. As educational institutions, they have drawn much criticism even from those who hold the most progressive American point of view. This is probably best, all things considered, for a people believing in democracy.

For after all, there is something fundamental and timeless in American education. In any adequate attempt at education this should have due consideration. This timeless element in education needs at the present time a re-emphasis. If we here altogether were to attempt to make a definition that would be accepted by every one, I believe we should agree that education involves this basal thing,

namely, acquaintance with the world we live in. If we should accept that definition as a starting point, we should have to agree at once that education involves more than training, more than wage-earning capacity, more than efficiency. It may involve all these things, but it is more than any of them. We should have to agree that a college aiming to train for any specific vocation or line of work is not, strictly speaking, an educational institution, for on the basis of our definition we should have to agree that education involves a recognition of values in the wide world, in nature, in books, in people, in society, in government. We should have to agree that it means citizenship and a home feeling in our natural and social world. We should have to agree that it means a release from narrowness, provincialism, from bigotry and caprice, and that it means the gradual identification of ourselves with a universal purpose and task. All this, not necessarily, but usually, is beyond the aim of training as such, beyond the aim of the vocational school as such.

Training and education, we should understand, are not necessarily the same. They are often regarded as the same, and even when not so regarded are confused and undifferentiated in the public mind, even in the minds of men whose lives are spent in educational institutions. It ought not to be necessary to say that a man may be a trained expert in aeronautics and not be educated, an expert bridge builder, an expert pianist, and an expert farmer, and not be educated. Nay, verily, he may be an expert in Latin, or Mathematics, or Philosophy, and not be educated in the true sense. It may be said also that a man may be educated and not be trained distinctively in any of these and many other forms of labor and achievement. We must grasp the idea that education makes any subject external and subsidiary. It refuses to admit that any subject in itself is cultural. On the other hand, it does not exclude from the cultural element bridge building or Mathematics, or flying machines, or Latin or Philosophy, but it does insist that we shall not find an end in any of them. It does in-

sist that proficiency along any of those lines is not a final achievement. They furnish merely a method of expression for the man. Education, speaking truly, makes any and all of them a medium of a universal purpose, and only that. The present-day college is to show this.

If a man is reduced to the mechanical dimensions of his work and the size of the income derived from it, then he is not educated, or if he has been educated, he has not remained educated. This is true of course regardless of income or regardless of the value of his work considered by itself. In such a case, a man's antecedent life has been just an apprenticeship. He may be doing a notable and splendid thing, but no longer is he expressing in his life the fundamental essence of that state of mind and life which would characterize education. It would be hazardous, for example, to say that Darwin was not educated. Of course, he was educated, but there was a sense in which he had lost his education. His mind, intent on a certain definite achievement, became atrophied in various directions. Literature and music and social movements as such were without interest for him. In his particular case perhaps it was wise, perhaps it was best, that it should be so. Nevertheless, so far, he had lost breadth of view and warmth of sympathy, which contribute to genuine citizenship. He lived in a world of his own making, glorious and wonderful, but not in the world of human life and movements. This is an extreme illustration, and perhaps not relevant to the present discussion, but it serves to emphasize the fact that a man may lose his education just as we are in the habit of saying in conventional phraseology that he may lose his religion or lose his soul. His education is not an accumulation of facts. It is not dexterity in any particular direction; it is not eminence in any specific work. It is, after all is said and done, a state of mind and heart and soul to which everything he has learned contributes and which makes a man alive to the world in which he and his neighbors and his fellow citizens live. It makes him an active agent in a social world. The present-day college is to seek this.

An educated man, in the sense in which I wish the term to be understood, is Mr. Theodore Roosevelt. We have laughed much about his proneness to discuss and write about any subject whatever, and not a little ridicule has been heaped upon him for the superficial treatment of subjects requiring long and laborious investigation. But he represents a type, an extreme type it may be, of the educated man and suggests what college education, perhaps in a much narrower sense, ought to mean. Mr. Roosevelt is alive to the world in which he and his neighbors live. He is a citizen of the world and is at home in the great movements of nations and society. He is awake to the world's processes, to its thought, its growth, its destiny.

We admit that he is an extreme example on one side of the question as Mr. Darwin is on the other, but Mr. Roosevelt emphasizes the fact that a man may live in a special world of intense activity and still not lose the spirit that the present-day college ought to give. He may live in the world and not lose his education, just as he may live in the world and not lose his religion or his soul.

After all, the American people want education in the broad sense, and a college that will give it, and *they need it as never before*. If they only knew its significance they would insist on having it, just as eagerly as they, too many of them!, are now insisting on an institution for their children providing training and vocation and life work, without any regard to an educational foundation. They are being cheated of an adequate education because it is overshadowed and obscured by schools and courses that emphasize training disguised under that artful and poorly understood word "efficiency." Efficiency too often is understood to be the ability to manage a machine, or to make a machine, or to get a job. These are all noble ends. No one wishes to object to them. But they should not pre-occupy the educational field. They ought not to put out of business the present-day college.

It is the function of the present-day American college to put education based on the ideal of citizenship in a self-

governing community in the foreground, to put education based on the ideals of a sympathetic understanding of men and movements, in the foreground; and to give this fundamental education an approach to a life work and to a training for life, by a proper and elastic organization of subjects and opportunities. Education in the present-day college should mean the right adjustment of theory and practice, of knowledge and training. It should mean the bringing together of education in the narrow cultural sense, and training in the narrow vocational sense, so as to prepare a youth to be a large man or woman, ready for a future work, and for living in a self-governing community. It is the function of the American college to do this. It is the only institution that can adequately do it.

Education is not books or courses, neither is it knowledge and understanding, but rather tone, color, atmosphere, attitude, spirit, the assimilation of qualities which makes what we learn from books and courses, and what we have of knowledge and understanding, live in us and *express itself in some fashion through us*. The present-day college education implies living together, aspiring together, achieving together as a community. They imply unity of purpose, adjustment in relation to cooperation for specific ends. Cardinal Newman said something like this in one of his essays, "What makes a University?" But he had in view the English University with its small groups, where there was the discipline and the inspiration of community ideals, and of community purposes. He would not have understood the uncontrolled heterogeneous life of the American University, particularly as it has developed in our Western States. There are some Eastern *university colleges*, for example Yale, which might stand the test of his interpretation, but in general the only American institution that is in a position to justify itself by such a standard either as now attained or as an ideal to be reached, is the *College*, not confused in its purposes by the affiliation of professional schools; or by the over-emphasis of vocational, wage-earning, ends.

Plato, twenty centuries and more ago, came near to defining the true college when he described the true state; in making the state a big family, he undoubtedly carried his principle of a "corporate unity" too far, but his statement of the foundation ideal of the state is one of the most inspiring and dynamic in literature. "What," he asks, "should the state aim at? What is the greatest good and what the greatest evil that can come to it? Can we find any greater evil than that which draws it apart and makes it many? or a greater good than that which unites it and makes it one? The state which comes nearest to an individual in its feelings, so that it is like a man, in the fact that when a finger is hurt, the whole community of the bodily members feels the pain, and so we say the *man* has a pain—in his finger—this is nearest the ideal: The best organized state is nearest to this. When one citizen suffers good or evil, the state regards his experience as its own and feels joy and pain with him."

Plato's emphasis upon this inner community spirit is fundamental. It is something vastly greater and more vital than any mere organization, or mere benevolence, or concession to the rights of others, or any of the other substitutes for it.

If we should change the word "state" to "college" in Plato's description of the state, we should have a present-day definition, and a fairly adequate one, of the college.

President Hyde in his Practical Idealism discusses the state in terms of similar import. But the college is a state in miniature. By its regulations, traditions, ideals, customs, it breaks down the hard and fast separation of individuals against each other, and transforms them into co-operating members of a united whole. It enlarges the range of the individual's interest and sympathy and devotion and makes him one with all the other members of the college to which he belongs."

Even so,—fundamental as the community spirit is, it is in danger of being circumscribed. Those saturated with it might think themselves a chosen people, favored of

the Lord; might be bigoted, provincial, stiff-necked and hard-hearted. It is only when this community spirit overflows the narrow boundaries within which it was generated and becomes a moving and a dynamic principle for the body politic, however large it may be, and even for the entire world, that we have any right to be satisfied with it. The value of community spirit in college is in proportion to its ability to express itself in society in life out in the world. A generating station for life interests, purposes, tasks—social, universal in their bearing.

A distinguished gentleman in public life was heard to remark recently that the aim of education in the past has been dominantly *selfish*, that it has been to get a job and to prepare to make a living. It ought now, he affirmed with emphasis, to become altruistic. Altruistic is perhaps not the right term to use, for there is a higher term and a higher purpose for education than mere altruism. Altruism may confine itself to a single individual, may confine itself to those within the group. Public spirit, and this is what the gentleman had in mind, is the identification of one's life with great interests, and that is a far higher thing than mere unselfishness. The medieval conception of Christianity was sufficiently altruistic. It prompted the giving of alms, the helping of one's neighbors, it tried to alleviate distress, all of which is very good, but it did not rise to a higher level to the conception of the establishment of better civic, social, public conditions. It did not really grasp Christ's conception of the Kingdom of Heaven, of community life, with which the individual the educated man should identify his hopes and aspirations. One may rise to a very high level of daily sacrifice and not rise to the remotest realization of the Kingdom of God,—or the Kingdom of education. One may do acts of kindness every day, but yet not realize the meaning of citizenship.

We ought to protest against the stupid blunder, very common, of supposing the social will to be antagonistic to the full development of individuality rightly conceived. As a matter of fact, true individuality and the right realiza-

tion of the social consciousness are absolutely essential to one another, and are in fact complementary and not opposed terms. Thus it is often and truly remarked that one cannot render any significant social service unless he has a rich personality, unless he has something within himself that is worth giving to others, and conversely it is remarked that one of the essential elements in a developed personality is responsiveness, sympathy, readiness to help. All these taken together mean public spirit. The relation, however, is far deeper than is usually conceived, even by those who make the observation just noted. Fundamentally, the fulfilled individuality needs social reference at every point, just as truly as photography needs light. The acceptance of the universal task, the relating of one life purpose to the larger whole of which he is a part, is the supreme condition of individuality as opposed to eccentricity. On the other hand, a society which disregards the individual, a society in which individuality is sacrificed to efficiency is likely to disintegrate, and certainly will not advance.

It is a harmful mistake to assume in the educational process that individuality is to be developed first and its social expression, or social reference, is to be realized afterward. Such an attempt would devitalize the educational processes and strip it of the intense appeal which alone can make for its development in any large way. The demand of the student for real social expression, the passionate desire to be "in things," the dislike for the life of the "grind," these things are all wholesome expression of his deep need for relating his life to some larger community whole. Of course, it is perfectly true that ultimately the work of the classroom has a larger social reference than these college "activities" as they are called, for they acquaint him with a vastly larger world than the college world, and aim to prepare him for his task in that larger world, but these cannot in the nature of the case be made plain to him at once. The statement and reiteration of it a thousand times carries less conviction than a single concrete friendship. It will only be realized after his life purpose grows

and becomes articulate as his experience broadens and enlarges, as his outlook becomes clearer. In the meantime the preliminary membership in the college world should become a profoundly rooted reality in his life.

We only have to open our eyes and look about us to see that the social ideal is becoming dominant. Medicine is becoming a social science; law is becoming a social science health is becoming a social affair. There is a story related that in New Zealand there is a tribe of people that consider it a crime against society for one to become sick. Such a one is brought before the magistrate and an investigation is made to determine the great extent of his social sin. This may be a myth, but it illustrates a state of society that is becoming more and more dominant. In the face of actual facts it is strange that education, particularly in the specialized courses of the universities, is growing daily narrower and more self-centered. The social ideal is lost sight of in the hairsplitting differentiations that are made in the classifications and analyses that are constantly going on in laboratory and classroom.

Hegel grasped the meaning of the social ideal as I have attempted to state it. He brings out very clearly the idea that participation in legislation is not what makes a real political community. If the people vote as an aggregate and not as an organism, with no real unity of purpose and consciousness of public interest, then their public participation is quite useless. Consequently a community cannot by organizing a self-governing association give training in true citizenship. The trouble with our present government is that it is a conflict of opposing interests instead of an outcome of community interests. It must be said that the growing number of independent voters is evidence that community interests, and not merely party interests, are receiving increased attention. A different type of citizen is coming to the front, which indicates that there is an improved type of education.

Real living is community living in a higher and fuller sense than the world has ever grasped. Individualism,

whether it be selfish or unselfish, is the cardinal sin in present-day society for the simple reason that it blocks any movement which has in it the hope of solving the evils of our present-day society. Indeed it may be fairly questioned whether society is not served better by selfish individualism than by unselfish inasmuch as the latter tends to obscure the issues involved. It has been wisely remarked by Lieber that liberty is more indebted to bad kings than good ones, as under them all the plans for liberty have been worked out, for example, Magna Charta and the Declaration of Independence.

A college that does not prepare for citizenship, however high its standards, in other respects, is failing and failing disastrously. This cannot be achieved simply by theoretical teaching. This type of teaching may give the clearest possible intellectual conception of what true citizenship means and involves. The student during these fruitful years must have a large practical experience in community action and community feeling.

The extension of the conception of education through the recognition that many realms of practical life may be the instruments of securing cultural values has led to regrettable confusion of thought as to the place of such courses in a liberal culture curriculum. A certain number of vocational courses which have a real bearing on what the student expects to follow as his great life task is not only permissible, but highly desirable as the best means of making him realize that culture and life are not two separate things but the same thing.

On the other hand, if too large a part of the curriculum is given to such special training for a particular task, we may be practically certain that the task will not be universalized in any adequate way. It will be universalized only as a means of making a living, and the sooner we realize that an education that issues in that view of one's life work, whatever that work is, has failed of its most essential function.

The present-day college must give a conception, and a

concrete conception of the world to which that life work is related, in order that it may be conceived as a universal task. It is easy enough *verbally* to define the relation of any life work to the larger whole of the social world. It is not easy to know the trend of history, the ideals and aims of other men, the experiences of the past, the loves and hates and aspirations of other men in such a way as to value human progress and to know what it means. Nearly all the studies of the curriculum should aim at making a student acquainted through literature, history, art and science, with the world in which he ought to live, or what is the same thing, should aim at making the world in which he will actually live (that is, the little world of his own and his neighbor's affairs)—should aim at making it the larger world of the past and present, and with it should aim to give a vision of the future. This is what should be meant by pursuing vocational studies in a liberal culture atmosphere.

The forces working for the democratization of education have brought with them a wave of distrust for what is called culture, a wave that threatens to engulf, indeed already has engulfed, many very precious instruments of education. The momentum of this movement is primarily due to two causes: first, the demand that the business man, the technical expert, the farmer, should receive advanced education as well as the professional man. This demand has required a more practical equipment on the part of institutions of higher grade. The second cause is the discarding of the so-called cultural subjects, or the unquestioned debasing of those subjects as parts of the essential curriculum, through a misconception of culture, and a consequent false method of teaching them. When the so-called cultural ideal reigned supreme in our colleges, culture to a large extent came to be conceived in an altogether vicious way, as a thing apart from and antagonistic to practical ends. There came to be a blind devotion to certain subjects and to certain realms of thought for their own sake, as if they constituted an open sesame to an aesthetic and intellec-

tual heaven for superior souls. Just so religion has often been conceived in the past as a realm of special saintliness for the elect apart from the rest of life. Just so culture was conceived as another sort of lofty idealistic life for another type of gifted nature. This had led many healthy natures to revolt from both religion and culture. When it was observed that the so-called practical subjects often seemed to yield a deeper and more practical culture than those preferred ones, and that every-day experiences often yielded a deeper and stronger character than the so-called religious saintliness, it was very natural that many became advocates of the view that all studies were of equal value culturally, and all activities and experiences equally valuable ethically. But the world has broadened on both points. Experiences do differ profoundly in their value for character, and subjects differ profoundly in their educational significance and functions. The next step in our educational advance must be in the direction of discrimination and articulation upon a new and broader basis than that of the past. It must connect culture with life and with usefulness. It must define it not as Matthew Arnold defined it, as "knowing the best that has been said and thought in the world,"—an utterly superficial and inadequate definition; but it must define it in terms that have to do with a life attitude and an inner disposition, a regenerated heart and will and not simply an intellectual apprehension. Such a conception we may not yet be able to define perfectly, but certainly a large element of it will be in the universalizing of one's life task. The best literature, the best art in the world may make a most valuable contribution to that end, but one may know them well in a purely capricious and self-centered temper, might know them so that any educational value they might have would be annulled. The measure of culture is not good taste but creative energy. A discriminating connoisseur in literature, music or art may be utterly boorish and provincial in all his practical adjustments to life. On the other hand, one occasionally sees a spirit having the slightest acquaintance with the

great ideals and spiritual creations of the past which has somehow won for itself an immediate instinct to see things at once in their larger bearings and relationships, to value the interests of others, to respect their experiences, to contribute to the enterprises of the community, to be a partner in the management of the politics of the community, all of which are higher marks of culture than discriminating taste and delicate perceptions, precious as are these gifts or acquirements.

The college of the past aimed mainly to educate the ministers. The college of the present aims to educate citizens, whether they are to be ministers, lawyers, business men, or farmers. The college has come to be a social institution. If it would achieve its purpose, cultivate the ideals of citizenship: that should be its new, all-inclusive vision. Often at present its development in this direction has been largely unconscious and incidental. It should now become conscious. The change that has already come about is startling in its reach. Young people from every walk in life and with every variety of aim have come into its halls, and with them has come the insistent demand for new subjects, for less rigid requirements of old subjects, until the curriculum has become democratized. It is well for us to keep in mind that the change in curriculum to meet a growing and insistent need is not yet finished. In both of these cases, and without consciously willing it, the college has become in very truth a school of citizenship.

Other changes quite as important have worked with the same end. Intercollegiate athletics and other outside activities have given each college community a unity and solidarity of feeling and will that have made it to a larger extent than ever before a commonwealth, a small civic community to prepare for the larger one. With this growth in community consciousness has come a growth in the demand for community organization and government.

The replacing of Faculty government by student government is no accidental caprice. It is a spontaneous growth that was inevitable in the new conditions, one of

the elements in the unconscious evolution of the college as a school of citizenship.

The college simply as an "institution of learning" is no more. The college as a new community experiment has the center of the stage. Learning is but one of its functions. Happy is the teacher, happy is the executive of the college who grasps the trend of the evolution and co-operates with it.

Is the college as such, admitting the changed conditions and new demands, still in a position to render a unique and needed service in the educational world? In answering this question, it must be remembered that a large factor in the new adjustment is the phenomenal growth of the university, particularly the state university. In western education particularly this is the most important factor to be reckoned with. If the college and university are doing the same work, fulfilling the same functions in our new educational world, then as sure as the railroad succeeded the stage coach will the college have to close its doors.

Competition can not long be the normal relation of these two types of institutions. Their relation must be supplementary, each with a function distinctly its own, if they are both to survive as vital parts of the educational system of the future. The present-day college must show that it is doing a work that is not done and cannot be done by the university, and is doing this work, so far as the university attempts it, in a more fruitful and adequate way, a more fundamental way.

Does the conception of the college as primarily a school of citizenship furnish an opportunity for such a differentiation of functions? And what does citizenship in the full sense of the term mean and require? It means the universalized brain, heart and will. To achieve this end is the supreme task of the present-day college.

The purely intellectual aspect of this task has been in the past the only one that has been clearly recognized. Science and history and logic and mathematics and languages all have helped to introduce the student to this larger

intellectual world. Our education has failed to realize that *understanding* may grasp the life relationships while life itself is there at the bottom still seeking and struggling; while the life fails to relate itself, either actively or sympathetically, to its environment.

What should be the college program for carrying forward toward practical realization the suggestions that have been made?

First, The scope of the admission requirements should be enlarged so as to meet the conditions established by courses offered in the accredited high schools. If this is not done many students who ought to go to college will go to a technical or professional school. The enlarged scope of the admission requirements involves a corresponding enlargement in the college curriculum. The world is going in for "higher education." The present-day college must take cognizance of this fact. The college, particularly the college in the West, cannot solve the problems connected with this condition by a narrow and out-grown place. It must adjust itself to the fact that the college is made for man and not man for the college.

Second, There must be a freer grouping of subjects and a freer treatment of required courses. I am not advocating free election,—it has been tried and found wanting; but I am concerned that the basis of grouping for a college course should have in view the development in the student of some consciousness of the great range of the life in which inevitably he is to have a part, or to which he is to relate himself, together with some introduction to that which he expects to be his life task. Possibly the studies may be arranged in groups from which the student may select freely, but from each of which he will be required to select a certain number of hours. For example, there may be a language group, a philosophical group, a physical science group, a social science group. In this way, we may be certain of developing in the student, on the intellectual side at least, the various forms of consciousness which we regard as fundamental: the health consciousness, the eth-

ical consciousness, the social, the esthetic, the creative consciousness. Such a system would be free from the evils of an unrestricted election, and also from the evils of rigid requirements.

Third, Politics, government, business, and related subjects will have a high place in such a curriculum, but at the same time it will be understood that citizenship in the true sense requires quite as much the understanding of human experience, aspiration and achievement as it does knowledge of political laws and functions. In other words, literature, art and history are quite as essential to education for citizenship in any large meaning of the word as are the so-called social sciences. And the natural sciences will be conceived more broadly in their cultural aspect as interpreting a great branch of the larger world of which every educated man should be aware, than they ever have been before. The college is a social institution. Every possible effort should be made to make the college a microcosm, a practical democracy, a retaining school for citizenship in a self-governing community.

Fourth, A process which has already been begun will be carried vastly farther than has yet been done. The old-fashioned, so-called cultural subjects will have a re-birth, a re-incarnation into the every-day world. They will be conceived, as all subjects should be conceived, simply as media through which the mind and heart are liberated from provincialism, and will be taught not as if the raw material had magic power to remake a life, but with the realization that they are absolutely dead unless a creative heart and mind relates them to the spiritual needs of the student. And not only will these subjects be taught on the basis of the raw materials, but through the media of their adaptation and readjustments to present-day life and thought in translations, in literature, in art, in architecture, in new phases of philosophy. It is the creation of thought and energy of the past that are precious in modern life.

Sixth, It is to be remembered that any program is a dead thing. People must make it live. Many of the peo-

ple that make up the ever-growing, changing, present-day college are students. The student's judgment, opinion, enthusiasm, loyalty, and his serious underlying purpose, should be a vital part of college government. The atmosphere, the spirit of things should be the master influence. A required chapel is out of harmony. The chapel or "assembly hour" is the most important spiritual educational, community influence of the college day. The chapel should be full, spontaneously full, but not required. Spiritual values, using the word in the large sense, are too precious to be under the supervision of the watchful eye of anybody. The present-day college must compel by its atmosphere. It will not compel everybody, nor would it by any method ever conceived. The chapel is merely illustrative, and I refer to it especially because it is a point in college life at which, because of our misuse of it, we oftenest lose an opportunity for developing the community spirit.

Seventh, The present-day college must recognize practically the relation between learning and doing. The technical school and the professional school have a vogue because they do that thing. I do not mean that a student is to learn this merely by becoming a wood worker, an iron worker, or a worker in electricity. He may not do these things in college at all. But he ought to learn the *connection* in some fundamental relation, certainly so in the realm of citizenship. He ought to learn to appreciate in college the wonder and beauty of a self-governing community where each is an integral part of the whole.

There has been a wonderful advance toward this ideal. To be sure, it has been largely an unconscious advance. Time and circumstances have been working it out and are still working it out. Athletics and outside activities of all sorts have been vastly significant in developing the community relations and in promoting the spirit of loyalty. In some institutions these are the only influences that have a positive trend in that direction. For that reason, they are doubly precious. They make a distinct contribution to real education.

Eighth, The curriculum of the present-day college must be regarded as subordinate to the individuals related to it—to the teachers and the taught. The curriculum is only a starting-point. The spirit of life contributed by the individuals who have to do with it is what makes it worth while. It is the individuals who spiritualize the college and give it a momentum in one direction or another. The momentum of the college as a whole should contribute specifically to the development of the student consciousness along fundamental lines. The fundamental lines are as follows:

Health Consciousness—A student's health should be examined on admission to college as carefully as his intellectual preparation. He should have oversight from this point of view during his entire college course.

Christian or Ethical Consciousness—It needs no argument to make it clear that every graduate of a standard institution should have some conception of the meaning of the great Christian ideals of life.

The Social Consciousness—The world is a social world. The student must be prepared to live in it.

The Aesthetic Consciousness—The world is a world of beauty. It is an educational sin to permit men and women to go through college blind, deaf, and unawake, in the midst of the beauty of nature and art.

The Creative Consciousness—A student on graduation should be on tiptoe to go forward to the work of life. He should be alive to his creative powers.

It is impossible here to discuss in any detail these points. Every institution must adopt its own method in achieving desired results, but a present-day college must be alive to their significance.

THE PLACE AND FUNCTION OF THE DENOMINATIONAL COLLEGE IN EDUCATION.

WILLIAM H. CRAWFORD, PRESIDENT ALLEGHENY COLLEGE.

Before touching at all upon the place and function of the denominational college in education, it is important to get before us a clear idea of what the denominational college actually is. Much has been said of it—good and bad, in praise and in blame; and it has been variously defined. No definition as yet proposed seems to satisfy all, or even a majority, of those who are naturally interested.

For the purpose of this paper, the denominational college will be regarded as expressing itself in three types:

First, The college which is under the control of a Christian denomination, through ownership or otherwise. Ownership is easy to understand. The college charter makes it clear. But the matter of control is not always easily determined. It is enough that we take into account only what appears in the charter or other official publication. If any one of these documents shows that an institution requires that its president shall be a member of a particular denomination, or that a majority of the trustees shall be elected by, nominated by or approved or vetoed by, a denomination, or if it is shown that a theological or ecclesiastical test is applied in the selection of members of the faculty or members of the board of trustees, such an institution ought to be described as being denominational on the ground that it is controlled by a particular denomination of the Christian church.

The second type is the college which stands in affiliated relation with a Christian denomination. A study of college charters shows that a goodly number of institutions, while not owned or controlled by a denomination, do, nevertheless, stand in a certain definite relation to a denomination. In some instances the relationship grows out of a charter right given to a denomination, or a right otherwise given, whereby the denomination shall have the privilege of electing a minority of the trustees, or of nominating a minority

of the trustees with the understanding that the nomination amounts to an election. In some instances a denomination may hold considerable funds, the income of which shall be available for the support of professors or for scholarships. All such institutions have a very definite denominational relationship. It cannot be said, however, that a Christian denomination exercises control in such institutions other than moral influence and control. Yet these institutions ought to be regarded as denominational colleges, and are so regarded by most, if not all, of the denominations.

The third type of denominational college is the college which stands in friendly relation to a denomination. One may examine the charters and official publications of institutions of this kind and find not a vestige of relationship to a denomination. The charter gives no hint of such relationship, nor does the catalogue. It is perfectly clear, however, that some of these institutions, in fact many of them, are just as truly denominational, so far as their general attitude and their atmosphere are concerned, as others which are under the legal control of a denomination. I could name several such institutions where the faculty, as well as the board of trustees, is made up almost entirely of members of a particular denomination. The students come largely from the same denomination. The spirit of the denomination, and its peculiar ideals, are expressed in a marked degree in the whole life of the institution. In some cases this friendly relationship is the remains of a former relationship which was legal, the change having been brought about to secure the favor of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching or to take advantage of some large gift or gifts in the way of endowment or buildings. In other cases the institution is a product of the community in which it is located, a community whose thought is largely dominated by the overwhelming influence of a particular denomination.

In general, then, it may be said that the denominational college is an institution standing in a definite relation, legal,

affiliated or friendly, to a Christian denomination. I fully understand that in thus defining the denominational college I am running counter to the established practice of the classification people. As the matter stands now, all colleges and universities from the standpoint of control are put in one of three groups: I. Institutions under the control of the state. II. Sectarian institutions, those under the control of the church. III. Non-Sectarian institutions. It avails nothing to say that the word "sectarian" does not appear in the published classifications. If there is a non-sectarian group, and there is, there must be some where near by a sectarian group. I desire at this point to enter a vigorous protest against this method of classification. It is a relic of a by-gone age. It is greatly unfair and altogether misleading to brand such institutions as the University of Chicago and Northwestern University as sectarian, simply because they acknowledge a relationship to the Baptist and Methodist denominations which have done much for their upbuilding. These institutions are not sectarian, and they ought not to be listed as such simply because they do not request that they be put in the non-sectarian column. May I express the hope that out of this gathering of college presidents there may come an action which shall lead to a readjustment in this matter of classification. Unless something is done about it very soon, an increasing number of institutions heretofore listed as denominational will go to the non-sectarian column to escape the stigma of a name which has come to have a bad meaning. In other words they will not much longer remain quiet under the charge that they are sectarian.

Now, as to the place of the denominational college, and its function in education:

(1) *The function of the denominational college is to encourage and perpetuate that form of higher education in which deep learning and fervent piety are forever united. In such a college religion will be regarded as a necessary factor in education, and the development of the spiritual life a fundamental part of the educational process. It is*

not enough that the denominational college shall teach religion. Religion may be taught in such a way as to prejudice the student against religion. There are a few of us still left who remember, not with gratitude either, the barren wastes we journeyed through in the formal instruction we received in Butler's Analogy, Paley's Evidences, and other studies of a similar nature. We may teach all the religion we please in our colleges; we may offer courses in the Bible, the Old Testament and the New, with a course in early church history thrown in; we may include Christian ethics and philosophy of religion, theism and missions, but if we do not do more than this we shall fall far short of reaching the Christian ideal in education. We must come back to this, that it is not the intellect of a man which is to be educated, nor is it the heart, but both heart and intellect. The *man* is to be educated. The one fine and high ideal all thru college ought to be manhood. The age of the student makes this of vital importance. The four years in college come while the boy is developing into the man, and the girl into the woman. The boy enters college at seventeen or eighteen. He graduates at the age of twenty-one or twenty-two, when the state regards him as a man and gives him the right of franchise. During these critical years it is vitally and transcendently important that the Christian ideal of manhood and womanhood shall be kept constantly before the student. It is the function of the denominational college to see that this is done.

It must be kept in mind that the denominational college is not less a college because it is denominational. As a college it must do all that any standard college is expected to do. The requirements for scholarship in a member of the faculty, the equipment for library and laboratory, the buildings for administration purposes, for lecture halls, or for the housing of students, are the same for the denominational college as for any college. The distinguishing feature of the denominational college is that it includes Christianity in its working program; not so much in the studies pursued as in its spirit and atmosphere. The de-

nominal college which is really functioning as a denominational college will not turn over the religious interests of the institution to the Y. M. C. A. or to the Y. W. C. A., or to both. These truly valuable organizations will be used, but the initiative for the religious life of the institution will be in the governing bodies—in the board of trustees and in the faculty. The college will be Christian because there is a definite Christian purpose in its government. It is freely conceded that a college may be Christian without being denominational. The difference is that any other college may be Christian, but a denominational college must be Christian. If the whole atmosphere of the denominational college is not pronouncedly Christian, it is unworthy of its name. The denominational college is founded and maintained because of a profound conviction that education is not complete and cannot be complete without religion. A university professor said to me once "Do you think there is such a thing as Methodist biology?" My answer was "No sir. But when my boy is old enough to go to college I want him where his Christian faith will not be undermined by the professor who teaches biology." Many a boy has gone altogether wrong during his freshman year because he has been caught in a new world of thinking from which God has been left out. The denominational college which is functioning as it ought will give the boy opportunity to study biology, chemistry, history and philosophy surrounded by Christian influences and ideals similar to those of his home and his home church. From the standpoint of Christianity, and with educational conditions as they are, the argument for such an institution is unanswerable.

(2) *What, now, is the place of the denominational college in education?* Historically it has had a large place and an enviable place. There is no need to report here the story contained in the earlier chapters of higher education in this country. The colleges founded in the revolutionary period and during the fifty years following the adoption of the constitution were practically all of them founded

under Christian auspices and with a distinct Christian purpose. They were denominational colleges. Up to the middle of the nineteenth century these institutions constituted nearly all the higher education there was. They rendered a service in educational leadership which has been freely acknowledged by all. They trained the leaders for every form of worthy activity in church and state. It is not necessary to go into particulars. The facts are well known by all who are at all familiar with our educational history. For more than three-quarters of a century the denominational college was the acknowledged leader in higher education.

In considering the place of the denominational college in education at the present time we must note some very marked changes which have come about, largely in the past fifty years. The more notable of these has been the creation of state universities, and their maintenance in a truly magnificent manner. This change has not materially affected the educational institutions in New England or in the middle states and Maryland. The institutions for higher education in all this region were well established before the state university was much thought about. In the central west, however, and in the far west and in the south, the state universities have come to a position of much influence and are centers of tremendous educational power. In many states they have filled the higher educational horizon. In the vast territory covered by these institutions are many denominational colleges which had been founded before the state universities. They were without much endowment; in some instances, without any endowment. Collections and subscriptions were taken in synods, conferences and presbyteries, for their support. There are those among these institutions which have more than held their own, partly through the financial help and inspiration given by such men as D. K. Piersons, Andrew Carnegie, and John D. Rockefeller. A goodly number of these institutions have obtained moderately adequate endowments, and have built substantial buildings. In the

country as a whole the denominational college is not the acknowledged leader in education it was a half century ago; it is, nevertheless, doing a worthy work and exercising a very large influence. From the most recent statistics I have been able to obtain, it would seem that fully half the college students of America are still in denominational institutions. And if we may eliminate the students in state institutions taking courses which are essentially professional, such as engineering, agricultural and domestic science courses, the students in the denominational colleges number considerably more than half the students of the entire country. It must be acknowledged, however, that some denominational colleges have been crushed out of existence by the new order and by the increased demands which higher education is making. Others have been compelled to combine, and still others are on the edge of a precarious existence. But over against these are the colleges which are growing and prospering. The educational institutions of the east are still in a sense furnishing the standard for the whole country. This is fortunate for the denominational college. In the central west and in the far west and in the south, as well as in the east, there are a considerable number of institutions, both colleges and universities, affiliated with Christian denominations, which are doing a truly superb work for higher education, and are at the same time rendering a noble service to the cause of Christianity. And this is being done notwithstanding the encroachments of the state universities, notwithstanding the higher educational demands which mean vast increase in equipment and cost of maintaining faculties, and notwithstanding the exacting processes of standardization which have been going on.

But what of the future? Every now and then some ready writer comes out with the startling announcement that the denominational college has served its day and generation, and must go. My own conviction is that the denominational college, call it by whatever name you will, was never more necessary than now. With secularism at

full tide, with the multiplied complexities of our modern life reducing more and more the time which may be given to things eternal with the gospel of service preached in many quarters in a way almost to exclude the gospel of manhood, with the ozone of moral earnestness and triumphant moral leadership much less in evidence than we could wish, with the state universities and some other universities giving a considerable portion of their effort to vocational and professional training, with commercialism and the commercial spirit dominating altogether too largely the life of the nation, it becomes us, as Christian men trained for the most part in the denominational colleges of yesterday, to give serious and earnest attention to that type of higher education which will yield largest results in moral and spiritual leadership. This type, as I believe, is best represented in the denominational college. For the positions of greatest responsibility, where leadership of the highest type is required, the Protestantism of America is almost wholly dependent upon the men who have been trained in the denominational colleges. Is there any prospect that it will be otherwise in the future? I see no sign of it. On the contrary, it looks to me that the Protestantism of the future will be even more dependent upon the men whose training has been in the colleges founded and maintained by Protestantism. Not long ago I read a report of some studies which had been made under the direction of the Board of Education of the Presbyterian Church. It was found first that of the recruits for the ministry, and for home and foreign missions, less than seven percent came from state universities, while an average of over eighty-three percent came from denominational colleges. A study was made of ten typical state universities, and it was found that only four young men out of every thousand male students are looking forward to the ministry; whereas in eight eastern Presbyterian colleges thirty-three out of every thousand, and in fourteen Presbyterian colleges west of the Mississippi one hundred and ninety-six out of every thousand, were expecting to enter the minis-

try. I believe in the state universities. I take it for granted that we all do. But is it not perfectly clear that these are not the institutions to which we must look for our future preachers, our future missionaries, and our future church leaders.

The critics who say that the state will take care of education, or that the money of the church is needed for missions and other benevolences, or that the colleges have already had enough money and ought to take care of themselves for the future, are looking only on the surface. Constructive Christian statemanship makes it necessary that we should look beneath the surface. Looking beneath the surface we shall find that up to the present time no institution has been established which will quite take the place of the denominational college. We need this type of college for the sake of efficient leadership in the church, for the sake of the home and social life of our people, and for the sake of the great cause of education in America. Education in this country is sadly lacking just now in moral dynamic. I am gratified that strong Christian men have gone to the presidency of so many state universities, men trained for the most part in denominational colleges. I hope to live to see the day when there shall be no state university in all this land which shall not have at its head a man of strong Christian character and influence. I want the superintendents of education in our large cities to be men of the same type. I want the same thing for the principals of our high schools, and all the schools. If this shall come to pass, it must be brought to pass. And I desire, as you do, that the denominational colleges, with their fine type of moral earnestness and their devotion to the Christian ideal of manhood and womanhood, shall help, and help largely, in the training of men for these positions.

The future is not without encouragement. There are signs of a renaissance of the denominational college. The Baptists, as I understand it, are just now asking for twenty million dollars for their institutions. The Presbyterians are asking for millions. So also are the Metho-

dists and other denominations. All of the leading denominations are showing new enthusiasm for the work of higher education; and with the distinct understanding that their institutions shall have the same educational tests applied which are applied to other institutions. They are not afraid of any proper method of standardization. They see clearly that their colleges must be as good as any colleges, if they are to commend the respect and patronage of their people. Such far-reaching plans as the denominations are now making cannot fail to yield results.

It is for the denominational college to be true to its traditions, and to function as a real Christian college. If it does this it will in the future, as in the past, make rich contributions to the Christian leadership of this nation and to Christian leadership in lands beyond the seas.

THE WOMAN'S COLLEGE.

WILLIAM W. GUTH, PRESIDENT OF GOUCHER COLLEGE.

Our subject does not raise the question either of the possibility or the advisability of educating women. The large number of women graduates from our leading colleges and universities has demonstrated the possibility of training the feminine mind, and time and experience have shown the advisability and the value of such training.

Nor does our subject include a discussion either of the co-educational or of the affiliated College. Each of these institutions stands independent in its own right and needs no defense.

We are to discuss "The Woman's College." This means, as I understand it, the separate college for women. The obligation of the state to educate its sons and daughters makes the co-educational institution inevitable. It would be poor economy for the state to duplicate its educational facilities in order to provide separate instruction for its youth. Aside from this young women have abundantly shown their ability to maintain themselves in the same classroom or laboratory with young men. Again, it is an

advantage, in some instances, to provide education for young women in separate class-rooms, but in close affiliation with a college or university for men. The success of Radcliffe and Barnard proves this.

But whatever the advantages of the co-educational or affiliated college may be, the separate college for women has its distinct place and reason for existence. The educational opportunities which many determined young women of from thirty to fifty years ago were seeking were not those offered by the finishing schools representing hardly two years of College work with a predominance of music, art and education. They were looking for equal rights with young men in the educational field. And they won these because of their native ability plus their persistent effort. In 1888 Vassar was twenty years old, Wellesley and Smith were firmly established, while Mt. Holyoke with a proud history behind her had entered upon full collegiate career. Bryn Mawr was also firmly established as a college. But she was then attacking another problem in the higher education of women, a problem the solution of which would establish the full right of woman to an education on the same basis as man, namely, the problem of University and professional opportunity. And Bryn Mawr successfully provided for the post graduate education of woman.

In 1888, it is said, only two Baltimore women had completed a four years' college course, one at Vassar and one at Cornell, the latter, as already indicated, being Miss M. Carey Thomas. Johns Hopkins was organized thirteen years before on a University basis. Its doors were closed to women. Every direct effort of the women to get in failed. They finally secured entrance as follows to quote Dr. Lillian Welsh: "In November, 1890, a committee of women from New England, the Middle States, Maryland and the South met in Baltimore and with Dr. Mary Putnam Jacobi as their spokesman offered the Johns Hopkins University \$100,000 for the foundation of its Medical School, provided that it should admit women on the same

terms as men. It was a historic occasion, not only for the education of women, but for the cause of general education, because for the first time in this country medical education was to be raised to a university standard. It is, too, an interesting and significant fact that two years subsequently when Miss Garrett completed the sum of \$500,000 necessary to open the Medical School, her letter of gift dictated the conditions of entrance which the University must require of prospective medical students."

To-day not only the Medical School but all the graduate departments of Johns Hopkins are open to women and the faculty of Johns Hopkins unites with the faculty of Goucher College in providing late afternoon undergraduate courses for teachers, and for others who cannot attend the regular class-room sessions, allowing credit for such work up to three-fourths of the baccalaureate requirement, the remaining one-fourth of the work to be done in residence at Johns Hopkins if the students are men and at Goucher College if they are women.

The impulse and influence of these educational militants operated in another and most important and very surprising manner. About the time that women were forcing entrance into the Medical school of Johns Hopkins "the first systematic effort was made to formulate a standard for the American College. It is a historical fact of great interest that this effort had its initiative and successful completion in a body of college women—The Association of Collegiate Alumnae. So well did its committee do the work committed to it that subsequently when the General Education Board and the Carnegie Foundation sought a working definition of what should constitute an American college they practically adopted the definition which had been worked out by the Association of Collegiate Alumnae." —(Dr. Lilian Welsh).

The early struggle of womanhood in this country to secure adequate educational opportunities and the watchful intent of the Association of Collegiate Alumnae to hold to this high standard form the bulwark of the higher educa-

tion of woman in America. The struggle and the standard apply to all forms of higher education for women. We may ask, therefore, What should be the particular purpose of a woman's college; that is, of a separate college for women. Strong light is thrown on this question by the character and ideals of the leading colleges for women. In a report of the U. S. Bureau of Education a few years ago six of these institutions; namely, Bryn Mawr, Wellesley, Smith, Mt. Holyoke, and Goucher were placed in class one, indicating that their graduates could pass to the graduate courses of American and foreign universities without further training. Each of these colleges is what one might call an old line institution, four of them requiring fifteen units and two of them fourteen and a half units for admission. These points must include Latin, Mathematics, Science, History, and, of course, English. The curricula of these colleges are made up of a rigid set of required studies, among which Latin and Mathematics and Science again find a place, the total number of required subjects ranging from fifty to eighty-four per cent of the course. The so-called vocational or utilitarian subjects are ignored. The nearest any of these institutions comes to household economics or domestic science, so far as I have been able to observe, is represented by a few courses in applied chemistry or micro-biology. These institutions pay some attention to the vocation of teaching, but practically none to library science, social science, secretarial work, or any of the other things that might look to the making of a livelihood.

These institutions are independent so far as the number of students who seek attendance is concerned. They all have about as many students as they can take care of. One has limited the number to one thousand, but is unable to hold to this limit; another has fourteen hundred, another sixteen hundred; some of them have applications for entrance up to four years in advance. All told, over five thousand students crowd these institutions every year. And yet, education for them is made neither easy nor utilitarian.

Other first class separate colleges for women are similarly circumstanced. Judging from the demand, this type of institution would seem to have had its character determined and set. The defenders of this sort of separate college for women are strong and caustic in their answer to the criticism of the highly developed and exclusive cultural course. "The modern advocates of special training for motherhood," says Miss Mary Leal Harkness, "seem to assume that children never grow beyond the stages of colic and teething, and to admit as a truth the adage, which I myself have always been charitably inclined to believe slanderous, that the way to a man's heart is through his stomach; for no suggestion seems to be made that a woman requires a trained intellect and broad interests to meet dangers and needs in her family no less acute and vital than indigestion and the ailments of infancy." The following so-called "maternal formula:" "I want my daughter to learn something in school, so that, if she ever *has* to work, she will be able to support herself," is thus commented upon: "A noble sentiment, is it not? My highest hope for my daughter is that she may attain the place for which she was designed by her Creator of being dependent upon the bounty of some amiable male creature with a good income; but if she *should* be among those for whom the designs of an omnipotent God miscarry, I wish her teachers to have provided her with some accomplishment convertible into sufficient income to keep her out of the poorhouse. That is all. There is no thought of the happiness which lies in the acquisition of knowledge itself; still less of the happiness and usefulness of the woman who fits herself for and who pursues some form of professional life, not because she is forced into it through failure to marry or necessity of self-support, but because she sees in it the truest means of serving mankind and developing her own character."

In a word, the nature of the first class separate college for women is cultural and its purpose character building. Because of its nature it would put its students into

touch with the present and past civilizations. This would include all that ministers to the uplift of mind and soul. Through its purpose, it would develop a combination of power and self-control, the essential elements of character.

The graduates of such institutions have shown that they are no less capable of taking their rightful place in the home, the church, the state, than the graduates of colleges where the entrance requirements are easier and the curricula not so rigid. In fact, experience has shown that from thirty to thirty-eight per cent marry and become homemakers. They marry wisely. The number of divorces from such marriages is practically nil. And an examination of the statistics shows a very surprising number of such graduates in responsible positions in institutions of higher learning, in the high schools and lower grade schools, in social service positions, in business. The number of capable and successful physicians is large and the number of lawyers or those serving in connection with the law is not small.

Of course, a college which holds to stiff entrance requirements and rigid curriculum is subject to criticism. But after all, "by their fruits ye shall know them."

The separate colleges for women do not criticise or depreciate the entrance requirements or the curricula of the state universities or of any other institutions. They simply say that they are engaged in another, perhaps distinct, kind of educational work. Whatever the condition or circumstances, they are known by their fruits, which are the finest from the educational tree.

We have described what we think are the nature and purpose of the separate college for women. Time doubtless will bring changes both in the entrance requirements and in the curriculum. But that time does not yet seem to have come. Simmons College, a splendid institution devoted wholly to vocational training, does not draw upon the enrolment of Wellesley, Smith and Mt. Holyoke, and at least two other colleges for women in New England have been organized since Simmons came into being. Institu-

tions ought not to be cast in the same mould. The separate college for women on the lines indicated has its definite and important place in the scheme of American education.

DISCUSSION

WM. HODGMAN, PRESIDENT OF MACALESTER COLLEGE.
President Hodgman:

The Chairman gave me the topic, "The Necessity for the Denominational College," but for two days you have been listening to such splendid utterances on this subject that I shall not repeat what has been already said, but simply content myself with stating the general proposition on which, as it seems to me, all other arguments must hang, especially in this critical time. In urging the necessity of the denominational college we make no invidious distinctions between the independent college and the denominational college; but because the denominational college still retains its vital connection with the parent church, it shares with the church the supreme opportunity and the supreme responsibility in this revolutionary age we are now entering. For nothing but revolutionary are the changes now coming in our religious beliefs, our economic and social relations, and our political life. The great European war is rocking the civilization of the world to its foundation. Political changes as momentous as those that followed the fall of the Roman Empire are imminent; changes in religious belief and practice as far reaching as those that flowed from the Protestant Reformation, an economic and social revolution comparable only in results to the French Revolution. This war is hurling into the melting pot the divine right of kings, the autocracy of cabinets, the fallacies of war and intemperance, and the privileges of wealth; and out of this crucible of agony of body, mind and soul, is coming the mind of Christ, a renaissance of the program of Jesus. In this reconstruction of the values of life, Jesus must be interpreted by the visible church, and this church must be led by men; and as in the past, so now these lead-

ers must come from the denominational college. In this collapse of man-made theories of life, this country must be a counsellor to disrupted Europe, a father to the growing children of these Western republics, a judge between the rich and the poor, a leader in the peaceable conquest of missions, commerce and the healing arts, a preacher of the unconquerable power of love. To this program of life the Christian church and the Christian college must dedicate themselves without qualification, hesitation or doubt. To these allies are committed the supreme opportunity and the supreme responsibility of projecting the spirit of Christ into education, society, business and politics. Is the denominational college a necessity? Never more so than in this day of man's confusion.

COLLEGE EFFICIENCY AND STANDARDIZATION; CERTAIN FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES.

S. C. CAPEN, UNITED STATES BUREAU OF EDUCATION

I was asked originally to talk on classification of colleges. Anyone occupying a position in the Division of higher education of the Bureau of Education between the years 1912 and 1915 could not long remain ignorant of the fact that classifications have been attempted and that however successful they may appear to the classifiers, the classified sometimes have had a different opinion. Circumstances have conspired to bring home to the Bureau with peculiar force the opinion of the classified. For the last year I have happened to stand at the point of first contact, and have been transfixed by each one of these opinions as it winged its hostile way into our midst. Naturally I have re-acted to the stimulus. I have developed an opinion of my own. It may not be final. I hope it is not, since the subject is new and changing. But at least it is definite and owing to the circumstances which have given rise to it, charged with feeling. I have already expressed it several times and I had planned to state it again here without pre-

liminary explanation. This explanation seems necessary, however, to account for the angle from which I approach the topic assigned for discussion.

What are some of the fundamental principles which should govern the classification of colleges? A helpful classification will surely take into account educational efficiency. As the last stage in the process it also involves standardization.

The first proposition I would lay down is that you can't have complete and definite standardization of all the colleges of the country without a definition of a college which is accepted the country over. Is there one? I know of eight or nine which have attained considerable circulation. There are, for instance, the definition of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, the definition of the New York Education Department, the definition of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, and the definition of the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States, all of which have a wide currency and have influenced the standards of many institutions. The first two are very brief. The New York definition makes no mention of the scholastic preparation of the faculty, the number of hours required for admission and graduation, the financial resources or the physical equipment of an institution. It is intended to be exclusive rather than descriptive. On the other hand, the definition of the North Central Association, which is more than 400 words long, touches upon all these matters. The definition of the Southern Association is of almost equal length but quite different in content. Which of these is the right definition? Will the Carnegie Foundation accept for its purposes the definition of the Southern Association? Will the North Central Association be willing to judge the colleges of its territory according as they conform to the definition of the New York State Education Department? If not where shall we stand? Who can tell what a "standard college" is? The first step in standardization is the determination of the standard. If

it is desirable that there shall be such things as "standard colleges" in the United States it is necessary to secure a general agreement as to what a "standard college" is. Can we get it? I doubt it and personally I question very much the wisdom of attempting to do so just now.

My reasons are these. In the first place it has never been proved that all the colleges of the country should conform to one type. Which is the better, the Williams type or the Reed College type, for instance? We may all have our opinions, but there is little evidence to support them. Secondly,—and this accounts in a large measure for the difference in types—the educational conditions of the country are by no means uniform. I have not yet visited all sections, but I have seen enough to be very keenly aware of the great variety of conditions to which colleges in various parts of the United States must adjust themselves. The educational needs of New England are not the same as those of the south. It is questionable whether the people of Montana and New York can be best served by the same kind of college. As long as these differences exist the establishment of a single national standard which all institutions must meet in order to be regarded as worthy the name of college is unjustifiable.

The first obligation of a college is to its constituency. After all most colleges are local institutions. A college draws from a wider area than a high school, to be sure, but the radius of the circle from which the majority of its students come is still comparatively short. It rarely extends much beyond the boundaries of a single state. The college must therefore meet the schools of the state upon a common ground. If the academic standards of these schools is low it should exercise a firm and constant pressure to bring them to a higher level. But if it should suddenly demand for entrance subjects which the schools cannot offer it would not only fail to serve the young people of its constituency, but it would probably commit suicide in a lingering and painful manner.

For the present therefore, I believe, and this is my

second proposition, that attempts at classification or standardization should be either regional or else for particular and limited purposes. Such classifications are already common. Most of them have been helpful. An excellent example of a regional classification is that of the Southern Association.

A few years ago the Association was confronted with a situation which, as far as I am aware, was not exactly paralleled in any other section of the country. Strong public high schools had not been developed. Most of the institutions claiming collegiate rank in the states represented in the Association were forced to maintain preparatory departments in order to fit students for genuine college work. Rich endowments were few. The majority of colleges must stretch their limited resources over a considerable field. Naturally no very distinct line was drawn between the preparatory department and the college. One administrative staff and one faculty often served both. To the unsympathetic observer the combined institutions presented a sort of dissolving view of college and preparatory school. For the sake both of collegiate and secondary education a change was desirable. Communities must be stimulated to establish public high schools. This it was felt they would not do as long as the preparatory departments of the colleges flourished in such numbers. Colleges must lift themselves to a higher level by enforcing more severe entrance requirements and by freeing themselves from the enervating influences of secondary departments occupying the same plant and claiming the time of the same teachers. Accordingly the Association proposes a standard which must be met by any college applying for membership in it. The standard prescribes a complete administrative separation of college and preparatory departments, calls attention to the importance of developing public high schools, and treats the subject of entrance requirements in some detail.

The application of this standard to the colleges of the southern states to determine which were eligible for mem-

bership in the Association resulted of course in a classification. Recognition by the Association means much. It is the stamp of approval by the highest educational body in the south. The effort to qualify for membership has brought a sound and rapid improvement in the quality of colleges in that section.

If there is as yet no single and general standard which may be justly applied to all the colleges of the nation, classifications on a national scale for specific purposes are nevertheless possible and very necessary especially just at this time. Let me illustrate.

Every year an increasing number of students go from small colleges which enjoy chiefly a local reputation and serve geographically limited areas to the larger graduate schools of the country. The officers of the graduate schools should know which of these colleges are able to give adequate preparation for graduate work. This is fair, both to the small colleges and to their students. Moreover it is simple justice to the graduate schools which should not be expected to waste their time and resources upon unprepared matriculants. A classification of colleges which will separate those equipped to act as feeders for graduate schools from those not yet equipped for this purpose is legitimate and desirable. The members of the Association of American Universities have sought such a classification for several years. In 1911 the United States Bureau of Education attempted to meet the needs of these institutions by preparing a classification of colleges on this basis. An unfortunate accident which subjected the undertaking prematurely to the stress of publicity led to the abandonment of the task before it was completed. But even in its unfinished state the Bureau's tentative classification has proved an immensely valuable document. It is one of the most important services which the Bureau has attempted to render American education. The suspension of the Bureau's work in this direction has not checked the process of classification of colleges with reference to their fitness to prepare for graduate study. It has merely trans-

ferred the burden. What the Bureau can no longer do for the graduate schools they are now trying to do for themselves. And if the interests of sound training for productive scholarship are not to suffer they must continue to do it.

This is one kind of limited classification. Owing to the prominence of the agencies involved it has probably received its full share of attention in educational circles. It has also reaped a rich harvest of criticism. But you will note that the standard or test applied relates to a single function of college education, viz: the preparation of students for advanced university studies. There are numerous other admirable and worthy ends which a college may pursue. These were not taken into account in the Bureau's classification. The fact that it has been indiscriminately used for other purposes and by all sorts of persons is not the Bureau's fault.

Just at this moment a nation-wide classification of colleges on still another basis would be useful. The Council on Medical Education of the American Medical Association has recently proposed certain standards which it regards as the essentials of an acceptable medical college. These include a preliminary college year which should be devoted to certain specified courses in science and modern languages. Progressive medical schools all over the country are adopting these standards. Some are requiring for admission two years of preliminary college training. They are now faced with the question "what colleges are equipped to give this particular preparation?" It is possible that not every reputable four-year institution may have adequate laboratories for the prescribed work in science. On the other hand some institutions not generally rated as full fledged colleges may be quite prepared to meet this particular requirement. It would not be surprising if a classification of collegiate institutions of the country were made very soon that would indicate which of them might be accredited by medical schools as furnishing satisfactory pre-medical training.

I have mentioned but three types of classifications, one of which has not yet been undertaken. But there are many others. The Bureau of Education has record of between 20 and 30 bodies which are now classifying colleges for some purpose or other. Possibly a few of them can be relieved of their labors in the future. But the necessity for further kinds of classification will doubtless arise. Such being the case it is reasonable to ask whether those who are concerned with college administration may calmly leave the matter as it is. I should emphatically say "no," and for this reason.

There is a woeful lack of reliable information about colleges. The classifying and standardizing bodies already in existence are seriously handicapped by this lack. Any sort of a classification is a serious thing for the colleges unfavorably rated. It should never be based on guess-work or hearsay evidence. Sometimes I fear it has been in the past. Consequently, and this is my third proposition, the question of classification or standardization will not be satisfactorily settled until full publicity of all the significant phases of college teaching and administration has been secured. As my positive contribution to this discussion I should like very briefly to suggest what I believe these significant phases to be.

For a number of years the Bureau of Education has been collecting and perfecting statistical records of enrollment; finances, including the value of physical equipment; and degrees. These are very vital matters and must be taken into consideration in estimating the status of university and college education in the country as well as in weighing the value of the work done by any individual institution. But there is a vast deal more that we ought to know. The following facts should be a matter of public record concerning any college.

What are its requirements for admission? And how are they administered? What does it demand for graduation? What subjects are prescribed? Does it have a

group system, free election, limited election, or closely outlined course?

The most important factor in any college is the faculty, yet how little is known about the faculty of the institutions which figure successfully or disastrously in the various classifications thus far attempted! There should be a record of the ratio of assistants and instructors to teachers of professorial rank, of the requirements in training or experience or both for holding professorial positions, of the actual training enjoyed by the members of the teaching staff. The number of hours of teaching required weekly and the number allowed which are of first significance. Teachers burdened with from 20 to 30 hours a week are seldom able to give instruction of college grade. The size of classes in subjects other than lecture courses, and the load in student hours carried by the various instructors help to complete the story of the way in which the teaching end of the institution is managed.

In any general estimate of the scholarly efficiency of a given institution the amount of compensation received by teachers of the different academic grades is also suggestive. The size of a man's salary is by no means always the measure of his power and value as a teacher. There are many admirable instances which prove the contrary. But in the long run institutions which pay very low salaries generally fail to get the best service.

Another aspect of college work of the utmost importance in estimating the standing of an institution for almost any purpose is its range. Yet this information is publicly recorded only in the college catalog, one of the recognized functions of which is to advertise the attractions of the institutions. There might well be published from time to time an impartial analysis of the offerings of the institutions of the country which would show how many departments or subjects are represented in the curriculum of each, what proportion of the courses offered are elementary or introductory, how many are distinctly advanced

courses of college grade, worthy the serious attention of juniors and seniors.

As I stated a moment ago in at least two of the classifications already made the work of colleges has been judged as preparation for university study. Clearly a valuable exhibit in any institutions' published documentary evidence of efficiency should be a record of the success of its graduates who have studied for advanced degrees at other institutions.

Already certain rough information concerning the library and laboratory equipment of colleges is compiled annually by the Bureau of Education. This should be more critical and detailed, especially as concerns the adequacy of the library for collegiate instruction.

These are some of the most significant categories under which the vital activities of a college may be grouped and judged. I do not pretend to have exhausted the list. In my opinion those relating to the faculty and the courses are quite as important as those relating to plant and finances. But whether you agree with me in this or not, I fancy there will be little disagreement as to the desirability of obtaining and making public these data before classification of any sort and for any purpose is attempted on a comprehensive scale. I should like to emphasize once more that publicity is essential. There should be no concealment of anything a college does or has. The record should be open to anyone who is curious, as it already is in the case of most publicly supported institutions. Then certain kinds of classification would take care of themselves. They would be almost automatic.

And yet when all is said and done the best part of a college can never be subjected to classification. Its spirit, its atmosphere, the earnestness of its students, the personalities of its teachers, the personality indeed of the institution itself can never be classified. And who doubts that these determine its real quality? The most we can do is to measure its shell and get evidence of its honesty or of the degree of its self-deception. But every classifying agency

should beware of relying too implicitly upon rules and schemes and figures. There is always large need for discretion, if justice is to be done. However, the complaints of unjust treatment now frequently made would, I believe, be generally silenced if such an open record of essential facts as I urge were secured. The methods to be adopted in attaining this publicity and the preparation of an outline of the facts which would be of most significance in revealing the standing of an institution might well be made the subject of study and recommendation by a national committee of the most distinguished and representative American educators. This leads me by way of conclusion to a concrete proposition which the Bureau desires to make.

The tentative classification of universities and colleges with reference to the bachelor's degree begun by the Bureau four years ago has been suspended for further consideration at the request of the President of the United States. The Bureau does not expect that the matter will soon be released. Temporarily, therefore, it is estopped from making any sort of a classification. Meanwhile the public clings with the utmost tenacity to the ratings suggested in the first tentative classification. Indeed more was read into them than was intended. This is both embarrassing for the Bureau and unjust to many of the institutions concerned. Colleges change fast. A classification three or four years old is on the road to superannuation if it is not already antiquated. Feeling then that the question of classification, or classifications, on a national scale is highly important, and being unable to take the initiative itself to break the "status quo," the Bureau recommends the formation of a committee composed of representatives of the principal associations which concern themselves with higher education. The function and constitution of the committee are indicated in the resolution which I am about to read. The Commissioner of Education respectfully requests your co-operation in this undertaking.

COLLEGIATE EDUCATION AS A NATIONAL PROBLEM.

ELMER ELLSWORTH BROWN, PRESIDENT OF NEW YORK UNIVERSITY.

This year is already notable in the world of education for the new periodicals and the new societies it has brought forth. I have not heard whether the proposed Association of University Professors was successfully launched or not, but one thing in the constitution prepared for adoption by that society gives me a text for this morning. It was stated that one of the objects of the organization should be "to facilitate a more effective cooperation among teachers in universities and colleges for the methodical examination and discussion of questions relating to education in higher institutions of learning."

It seems to me that the outcome of such a purpose, followed to the bitter end, would be to make of each college faculty a class in pedagogy. The courses to be pursued by this class would be one in *Hochschulpädagogik*. It would be repeated each year, with variations, and never passed by even the brightest member of the class.

The organization which you are forming this week, here in Chicago, might well enough adopt the same purpose as part of its program. Then the difference between the two societies in this one particular would probably be merely a difference as to who should conduct the faculty class in pedagogy. The society of college professors might say that such a class should have no head, but should conduct itself. The society of college presidents might propose that it be led by a dean or even by the president himself. The college professors ought to know whether a class needs a leader or not. On the other hand, our college presidents have most of them been college professors at one time or another; and the fact that they have enjoyed, or at least have undergone, this double experience, may have rendered them rather "set" in their own opinions. If the college president's original professorship should happen to have been in the field of educational theory and practice, the idea

of a college faculty that should meet from time to time as a class in pedagogy must appear to him as altogether charming. I know of one such college president at least who is strongly tempted to propose a program of this sort as soon as he goes back to his work, and then to look on cheerfully and see what will happen.

Really, though, there may be something in the idea. Why not? It is different, is it not, from the old familiar course of faculty meetings, and yet not so different as to be revolutionary. I can imagine that there may be college presidents so abounding in tact, and so richly endowed with the confidence of their faculties, that they could carry such a project as this into full effect.

It would involve some real addition to professorial burdens, and perchance some real addition to presidential burdens. It would mean a new and more concentrated effort to view faculty problems as a whole, and not merely as a haphazard summation of departmental and individualistic preferences.

Just to see how it might work out, I will venture to suggest certain topics that enter into the first year of the course:

What bearing has the more recent literature of educational theory upon the problems of college education?

What rights and responsibilities have the secondary schools that college entrance requirements are bound to respect? How shall we distinguish in this matter between the secondary schools who want the colleges to tell them what to do and the secondary schools who want to tell the colleges what to do?

What are the essential relations of general education to professional education, under actual modern conditions? How can we inject the seriousness of the professional school into the student life of the college? And do we want to do it if we can? And how long will the public take the college seriously if we don't?

How can we shorten the apprenticeship of young college institutions, for their own good and the good of their classes? What ought they to be taught about teaching, beyond what we knew when we began to teach?

What principles underlie the formulation of requirements for college admission and graduation? Or should these requirements represent merely a working compromise between rival interests in college faculties?

Why do the graduates of good colleges generally turn out reasonably well in life? Can we find out how the college has contributed to their success and to their moral character, and then work it a little harder in these directions?

And then, what is a college degree, really?

We should all of us be the more hopeful of the success of such excursions into the higher pedagogy, because of the work that we have already seen done by faculty committees. Have we not known such committees now and again to spend days and nights and many weeks on the revision of the curriculum or the formulation of some new policy? And the discussion of their reports by the college or university bodies to which they have been made,—faculties, councils, senates, or by whatever name they may have been called—has not that discussion often arisen to heights of real educational vision? After we have cast our gibes at the routine sessions of these academic bodies, the fact remains and must be recognized that some of the finest and most illuminating debates of genuine educational questions are those which infrequently go forward, without publicity and without excessive pedagogical consciousness, in these legislative bodies of our higher institutions of learning.

Let me go a step further, and make a remark that is so reactionary as to be almost radical: I believe that today our best knowledge and vision regarding the prevention and cure of disease is generally to be found in the medical profession; our best knowledge and vision regarding re-

ligion is generally to be found among priests and ministers of religion; our best knowledge and vision even regarding legal procedure is still to be found among lawyers; and our best knowledge and vision regarding education is almost as generally to be found among educators. Our main reliance for a comprehensive national program for our higher education must be the faculties of our colleges and universities.

We certainly need such a national program, less fragmentary, more organic, more free from internal competition and contradiction, than that which we now have. It seems fair that we should look to the teaching bodies of our higher institutions of learning for the gradual working out of the main lines of such a program. This is a subject for serious consideration by our faculties everywhere. Our faculty-pedagogy is to rise to its greatest height in the study and investigation of a real and influential National pedagogik, not to say a Volkerpädagogik.

It is not to be denied that recent events in Europe have intensified this conviction. It seems clear that the education of a people in the wisdom and ideals that make them strong and great, is as important for national self-preservation as is direct provision for the national defense. Even if it should appear as our national creed that no two citizens should think alike, we have still to achieve a national unity through the insistence that every one should know why he thinks as he does, and should learn to work with those whose thoughts are different. It may be that the first tenet of our ultimate American pedagogy will be that every man's education must be different from every other man's; but if so, this tenet will need to be balanced by two others, namely, that every man's education must be honest and thorough-going as far as it goes, and that every man must learn, as far as in him lies, to understand his neighbor's point of view.

The making of a really national provision for our higher education involves a good deal more than the defining of national ideals of instruction.

It involves such a determination of our standards as will assure confidence in our academic and professional degrees, both at home and abroad. This is a most difficult and necessary undertaking, on which a score of educational agencies, governmental, academic, and private, are now engaged. The constructive leadership of the Federal Bureau of Education in this matter is most timely and promising.

It involves a close consideration of the desirable distribution of colleges and universities. The information collected over a term of years by the General Education Board has an important bearing on this question.

It involves important questions of educational administration and control: The relation of state and municipal colleges and universities to those conducted under private auspices; the need and appropriate functions of a national university; the unlimited possibilities of interchange and cooperation between existing institutions; including institutions of special research and governmental bureaus as well as ordinary colleges and universities.

What a vista opens up on even a first consideration of this subject! The college faculty that should seriously debate such general questions as these would gain an educational perspective which is rarely attained by a few individual members of these bodies.

The vista indeed leads out much further than I have indicated. Every day it becomes more apparent that every large undertaking upon which our people may enter is conditioned upon improvements in our system of education. The advance of agriculture, the building up of foreign commerce, the extension of the suffrage and of various forms of direct legislation, the promotion of comprehensive justice and good-will in our industrial society—these are only a few examples. Every effort to realize more completely an American democracy depends upon education and more education. The larger democracy of humanity that we dimly foresee, the democracy of nations, to which America might contribute so much, makes an educational demand that is ever more exacting.

We do not have to discuss any of these problems at this time. The simple tale which I have had to tell leads up to these things and finds its moral where such discussion begins. And that moral may be stated in the briefest terms, somewhat as follows:

First, the life and work to which this nation is called will surely demand an educational consciousness and an educational program that shall be truly national:

Secondly, the fostering of that national consciousness and the making of that national program, must be primarily the work of our professional educators; and

Thirdly, it is to be desired that the faculties of our colleges and universities should consider not only the problems of their separate institutions, but should also contribute of their best wisdom toward the solution of these larger problems.

Addenda

The list of Members of the Association includes only those that had paid annual dues by the time of going to press. Colleges are sending in dues every few days. Since the list of members was printed, the following colleges have sent dues, and are now included:

University of Pittsburgh.....Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
 Kansas Wesleyan University.....Salina, Kansas
 Leander Clark College.....Toledo, Iowa

No distinction has been made between Members and Associate Members, as no authoritative distinction can yet be made.

Other colleges represented at the meeting in Chicago are:

Allegheny College.....Meadville, Pennsylvania
 Augustana College.....Rock Island, Illinois
 Beuna Vista College.....Storm Lake, Iowa
 Boston University.....Boston, Massachusetts
 Cumberland University.....Lebanon, Tennessee
 Elmira College.....Elmira, New York
 Greenville College.....Greenville, Illinois
 Georgetown College.....Georgetown, Kentucky
 Iowa Wesleyan College.....Mt. Pleasant, Iowa
 Luther College.....Decorah, Iowa
 Lafayette College.....Easton, Pennsylvania
 Lewis Institute.....Chicago, Illinois
 Loyola University.....Chicago, Illinois
 Missouri Wesleyan College.....Cameron, Missouri
 Municipal University of Akron.....Akron, Ohio
 Muhlenberg College.....Allentown, Pennsylvania
 Olivet College.....Olivet, Michigan
 Occidental College.....Los Angeles, California
 Swarthmore College.....Swarthmore, Pennsylvania
 Tarkio College.....Tarkio, Missouri
 Trinity University.....Waxahachie, Texas
 Tulane University.....New Orleans, Louisiana
 University of Cincinnati.....Cincinnati, Ohio
 Vanderbilt University.....Nashville, Tennessee
 Westminster College.....Westminster, Colorado
 Washington and Lee University.....Lexington, Virginia
 Willamette University.....Salem, Oregon

THE TELEGRAPH-HERALD
PRINTERS AND BINDERS
DUBUQUE  IOWA

